

Executive Summary

ES-05 Executive Summary - 91.300(c), 91.320(b)

1. Introduction

The Utah Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) has completed this 2015-19 Consolidated Plan as required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This plan and its accompanying priorities and goals are based on the quantitative data produced by HUD and reviewed by HCD Staff. Accompanying this 5-year plan is the 2015-16 Annual Action Plan for the coming program year. This plan contains the policies and goals of Utah's HOME, CDBG, ESG and HOPWA Programs. This plan was completed in cooperation with Utah's seven regional Associations of Governments (AOGs) which are: Bear River AOG, Five County AOG, Mountainland AOG, Six County AOG, Southeastern Utah AOG, Uintah Basin AOG, and the Wasatch Front Regional Council.

2. Summary of the objectives and outcomes identified in the Plan Needs Assessment Overview

Each program in the State of Utah Housing and Community Development Division (HCD) has set clear objectives to accomplish with the expenditure of our funds. The HOME program has prioritized the creation of new affordable housing. The CDBG program is concentrating on the sustainability of rural communities and specifically the support of public infrastructure and housing projects. Utah's ESG program is focused on the elimination of chronic homelessness. In emphasizing these goals HCD expects to make progress on the above stated objectives. HCD recognizes that efforts will continue to be needed in future years.

3. Evaluation of past performance

The programs within HCD are continually evolving and improving. The focus of efforts have remained consistent for the last few years, and while yearly outcomes vary year by year, outputs are fairly consistent in relation to funding. The State of Utah HOME program has consistently assisted in the construction of about 550 units of affordable multi-family units, and 150 units of affordable single family units. The HOME program has improved its leveraging and the prospects of the program are steadily improving. The CDBG program has seen its outputs decrease as Utah and Davis Counties have become entitlement jurisdictions resulting in the loss of funds for the state program. Nevertheless the CDBG program continues to emphasize public infrastructure and housing programs. The CDBG program plays a critical role in promoting the continued sustainability of rural Utah communities. Meanwhile the ESG program is making great strides in accomplishing its goal of reducing chronic homelessness. ESG is in

year nine of their ten year goal of eliminating chronic homelessness and is focusing its efforts on the rapid rehousing of homeless people in Utah. Moving forward, HCD continues to look at leveraging funds and improving partnerships in order to continue increasing productivity.

4. Summary of citizen participation process and consultation process

HCD proactively solicits public participation in the process of developing its Annual Action Plan. Throughout the program year HCD is in constant communication with local government and private community partners regarding both their needs and HCD's performance. Evaluation of performance is incorporated into the development of subsequent plans. Upon completion of the FY14-15 Annual Action Plan, HCD advertised that plan to staff, government partners, social services agency staff and clientele, elected officials, and the general public. The Annual Action Plan itself is prominently listed on HCD's website and is noticed on the State Public Notice Website.

The advertisement of the completed plan begins a thirty day public comment period. The advertisement indicates where to find the plan, who to contact for comment, as well as when and where the public comment meeting will take place. HCD staff attends the public comment meetings and record and respond to any and all public comment.

Much of the public outreach is conducted at the local level by Utah's seven regional Associations of Governments (AOGs). The AOGs, in cooperation with the state, write and publicize their own plans and efforts for the various counties and cities in Utah. This allows the general public to study, appreciate and comment on plans which are more specific to their communities. As part of their efforts, the AOGs advertise 30 day public comment periods and hold public meetings to gather input on their Annual Action Plans. The AOGs also work with local Public Housing Agencies in creating their plans. After completing this process the AOGs submit their plans to HCD. These regional plans influence the statewide plan.

This year, the 30 day public comment period began on April 1st and extended to May 1st culminating in a public hearing at HCD's main office, 1385 S State Street, Salt Lake City.

5. Summary of public comments

No public comments were recieved.

6. Summary of comments or views not accepted and the reasons for not accepting them

Not Applicable

7. Summary

The Process

PR-05 Lead & Responsible Agencies 24 CFR 91.300(b)

1. Describe agency/entity responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source

The following are the agencies/entities responsible for preparing the Consolidated Plan and those responsible for administration of each grant program and funding source.

Agency Role	Name	Department/Agency
CDBG Administrator		Utah Division of Housing and Community Development
HOPWA Administrator		Utah Division of Housing and Community Development
HOME Administrator		Utah Division of Housing and Community Development
ESG Administrator		Utah Division of Housing and Community Development

Table 1 – Responsible Agencies

Narrative

The Utah Division of Housing and Community Development Division houses the four HUD entitlement programs.

Consolidated Plan Public Contact Information

Elias Wise, Planning Specialist

1385 S State St.

Salt Lake City Utah 84115

801-468-0140

ewise@utah.gov

PR-10 Consultation - 91.110, 91.300(b); 91.315(l)

1. Introduction

Provide a concise summary of the state's activities to enhance coordination between public and assisted housing providers and private and governmental health, mental health and service agencies (91.215(l))

The various programs within HCD interact in diverse and unique ways with public and private housing organization, health agencies, service agencies, and the general public. In these interactions the state's relationship with the regional Associations of Governments play a critical role. Utah works closely with the AOGs to gain local public input on the various programs HCD operates. As part of our funding assistance to the AOGs, HCD requires that they consult with private and public service agencies in their regions. The AOGs efforts are catalogued in their Consolidated Plans and Annual Action Plan which we require them to complete on an annual basis.

Recently HCD has made efforts to ensure that all types of service agencies are being consulted as part of the AOGs process of completing their Annual Action Plans. Based off of HUDs online template, HCD has developed a "Consultation Tracking Form". This form asks the AOGs to list each consultation they make with the various organizations in their service area. The agencies, groups, and organizations that the AOGs consult include housing, disability, health, financial, employment, elderly, child welfare, planning, education, victims of domestic violence, civic leaders, neighborhood organizations and other nonprofit service agencies. In consulting with these organizations we ask the AOGs to indicate which part of their annual action plan was addressed, and what was the intended result and actual result of the consultation. The AOGs have strong relationships with the communities and service organizations in their various regions and are constantly in contact with them regarding their needs and priorities.

The ESG program, due to the manner in which it operates, has an especially extensive network of service providers with which it coordinates and administers its program. Homeless efforts in Utah are overseen by the State Homeless Coordinating Committee. The main funding sources for this committee are comprised of the state ESG funds, Pamela Atkinson Trust funds, Utah HOPWA funds, and Critical Needs funds. These funds are then divided among nine Community Action Agencies. These agencies are scattered throughout the state and focus on homelessness in their geographic region.

These agencies are each governed by a tri-partite board. This tri-partite board is composed of government officials, low income local citizens, and public community partners. The community partners are frequently members of government health, mental health, and service agency providers. As part of their responsibilities these boards discuss the needs of the homeless in the area and complete three year needs assessments. In completing these assessments the Community Action Agencies and

other agencies conduct surveys, and host community forums in order to engage the public. In some cases the Community Action Agencies are also AOGs.

This highly organized network of funding sources, community partners, agencies, and public citizens results in a highly coordinated and integrated push for ending homelessness in Utah.

Describe coordination with the Continuum of Care and efforts to address the needs of homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans, and unaccompanied youth) and persons at risk of homelessness

The State coordinates directly with all three Continuums of Care (CoC) on an ongoing basis by participating in Continuum meetings, leading strategic planning efforts, and supporting the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) and CoC funding priorities. State staff are very active in CoC meetings and attend regularly to stay connected to community needs and offer information and support as needed. This often informs gaps in strategic planning that then direct State efforts to fund specific initiatives or identify national experts that can be consulted or brought in to train to the issue. Some examples of these include support around coordinated assessment, new shelter planning, and SOAR training. Where the State houses HMIS, it is in a unique position to facilitate information sharing. This includes the creation of performance measure reports and opportunities for data warehousing with other agencies. Such efforts allow communities to focus on making data-driven decisions about how to most effectively deliver services and to whom. Staff are consistently identifying best practice to serve these target populations through national conferences and web-based materials. Utah has a robust plan for ending chronic homelessness and has directed several resources to this end. In addition to supporting housing subsidy, supportive service gaps are increasingly supported in light of CoC funding being directed away from supportive services and toward housing. Through the efforts of the state engaging national leaders, Utah has implemented a point in time count method whereby homeless persons are not only counted, but named and surveyed for services. This applies to all sub-populations of homeless persons and allows for a more direct matching of resource to need. The state specifically supports homeless families in innovative ways through utilization of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program and through coordinating rapid rehousing dollars from both the CoC and ESG programs. Veterans have also been a special area of emphasis in recent years with the VA Boot Camp push and participation in subsequent 100-day goals to end chronic homelessness among veterans and implement structural supports to more rapidly identify and connect veterans to services. Both veterans and unaccompanied youth will be addressed as part of a strategic planning effort among CoCs and the State Community Services Office. Collaborations with the VA Homeless Services Office and youth services providers facilitate better identification and assessment of both of these subpopulations. Finally, the state directly coordinates with, and supports, various homeless prevention efforts for persons at imminent risk of homelessness. Coordination and supports are facilitated through the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) and TANF programs. In order to better ground these programs in evidence-based practices, the State has led an initiative to create a coordinated assessment tool among homeless prevention providers, which is in process and should be in effect toward the end of the calendar year.

Describe consultation with the Continuum(s) of Care that serves the state in determining how to allocate ESG funds, develop performance standards and evaluate outcomes, and develop funding, policies and procedures for the administration of HMIS

State ESG funds are allocated through the State's Unified Funding process, which includes allocation recommendations from the State Homeless Coordinating Committee's Allocation Committee and approval by the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC). The SHCC is chaired by the Lt. Governor and is representative of homeless stakeholders state-wide. By design, a CoC president or leader from each of the three CoC's holds a voting seat on the State Homeless Coordinating Committee and thereby has direct authority for approving ESG allocation. In addition to ESG, the Unified Funding process includes other State resources, namely the Pamela Atkinson Homeless Trust Fund and Critical Needs Housing. These combined sources represent a three-year average of roughly 3.5 million dollars in homeless resource on an annual basis.

Prior to funding recommendations being made, each CoC is asked to consult directly with the SHCC Allocation Committee. Each year, in conjunction with the Unified Funding cycle, the three CoCs in Utah are given a list of applications submitted for Unified funding that come from agencies within their respective CoC boundary. A CoC representative is then invited to present their region's funding priorities to the State Homeless Coordinating Committee's Unified Funding Allocation Committee. This presentation of priorities may include long-term CoC goals, local needs and anticipated gaps. The priorities presented should be in line with research-driven, best-practice models and facilitate greater leveraging of CoC funds. These CoC priorities then inform allocation for ESG and State funds administered through the State Homeless Coordinating Committee. The allocation committee's final allocation recommendation is then presented for approval in a public meeting to the State Homeless Coordinating Committee at which time each CoC has the opportunity to hear how their priorities have influenced the allocation of funds and to vote for or against the recommended allocation.

The State office that receives ESG funding is also the designated HMIS lead agency and has directed the development of performance measures that use HMIS data and are in line with HUD directive and national best practice. Reports include system-wide measures that can be reviewed on the local community, CoC, or State level and will be published quarterly. Reports may also be crafted to isolate funding sources, such as ESG, and all ESG and CoC leads are given access to this data. CoCs have also teamed up with the ESG State agency to participate in monitoring efforts of all ESG recipients within their respective geographic area. Each CoC has a process for ESG recipient monitoring included in the policies and procedures that were submitted as a part of the 2013 CoC competition collaborative application.

The CoC's are responsible for HMIS project oversight and implementation, which encompasses planning, administration, software selection, managing of HMIS data compliance with HMIS standards, and reviewing and approving all policies, procedures and data management plans governing Contributing HMIS Organizations. The CoC's oversight and governance responsibilities are carried out by its Steering Committee, which includes representation from all three CoC's in the state as well as ESG

representation, local leaders and the Lead Agency HMIS staff. The steering committee reviews and updates all HMIS policies and procedures.

2. Describe Agencies, groups, organizations and others who participated in the process and describe the jurisdictions consultations with housing, social service agencies and other entities

Table 2 – Agencies, groups, organizations who participated

1	Agency/Group/Organization	Bear River Association of Governments
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Homeless Needs - Chronically homeless Homeless Needs - Families with children Homelessness Needs - Veterans Homelessness Needs - Unaccompanied youth
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The Bear River Association of Government works with the State of Utah in conducting needs assessments of local governments and administering the CDBG program in rural Utah. They are also required by HCD to complete their own annual action plans which include most of the same elements found on the State Annual Action Plan.
2	Agency/Group/Organization	FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-homeless Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Economic Development Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The Six County Association of Government works with the State of Utah in conducting needs assessments of local governments and administering the CDBG program in rural Utah. They are also required by HCD to complete their own annual action plans which include most of the same elements found on the State Annual Action Plan.

3	Agency/Group/Organization	SIX COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Children Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Services-homeless Service-Fair Housing Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Economic Development Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The Six County Association of Government works with the State of Utah in conducting needs assessments of local governments and administering the CDBG program in rural Utah. They are also required by HCD to complete their own annual action plans which include most of the same elements found on the State Annual Action Plan.
4	Agency/Group/Organization	SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Persons with Disabilities Service-Fair Housing Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Economic Development Market Analysis

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The Southeastern Utah Association of Local Government works with the State of Utah in conducting needs assessments of local governments and administering the CDBG program in rural Utah. They are also required by HCD to complete their own annual action plans which include most of the same elements found on the State Annual Action Plan.
5	Agency/Group/Organization	Mountainland Association of Governments
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Elderly Persons Services-Persons with Disabilities Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Economic Development Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The Mountainland Association of Governments works with the State of Utah in conducting needs assessments of local governments and administering the CDBG program in rural Utah. They are also required by HCD to complete their own annual action plans which include most of the same elements found on the State Annual Action Plan.
6	Agency/Group/Organization	UINTAH BASIN ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Services-Persons with Disabilities Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Economic Development Market Analysis

	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The Uintah Basin Association of Governments works with the State of Utah in conducting needs assessments of local governments and administering the CDBG program in rural Utah. They are also required by HCD to complete their own annual action plans which include most of the same elements found on the State Annual Action Plan.
7	Agency/Group/Organization	Wasatch Front Regional Council
	Agency/Group/Organization Type	Housing Services - Housing Regional organization Planning organization
	What section of the Plan was addressed by Consultation?	Housing Need Assessment Public Housing Needs Economic Development Market Analysis
	How was the Agency/Group/Organization consulted and what are the anticipated outcomes of the consultation or areas for improved coordination?	The Wasatch Front Regional Council works with the State of Utah in conducting needs assessments of local governments and administering the CDBG program in rural Utah. They are also required by HCD to complete their own annual action plans which include most of the same elements found on the State Annual Action Plan.

Identify any Agency Types not consulted and provide rationale for not consulting

Other local/regional/state/federal planning efforts considered when preparing the Plan

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Continuum of Care	State Homelessness Coordinating Committee	The State Homelessness Coordinating Committee helps determine the strategies and priorities of homeless prevention in Utah. The ESG program is part of this committee.

Name of Plan	Lead Organization	How do the goals of your Strategic Plan overlap with the goals of each plan?
Low Income Housing Tax Credit Plan	Utah Housing Corporation	The Utah Housing Corporation is the Utah Tax Credit Entity and many of the projects the HOME Program supports depend on Tax Credits for success.
AOG Plans	7 Regional Associations of Governments	The 7 regional Associations of Governments are each required by the state to write Consolidated Plans. These plans are reviewed and considered during the state planning process.
Wasatch Choice 20/40	Envision Utah	Envision Utah is used by Utah to complete regional multi-jurisdictional long range planning. Their efforts are considered when completing our planning.

Table 3 – Other local / regional / federal planning efforts

Describe cooperation and coordination among the State and any units of general local government, in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan (91.315(l))

HCD coordinates extensively with local governments in the implementation of the Consolidated Plan.

The HOME program has a community driven housing program in which communities with good affordable housing plans can propose and receive funding for affordable housing projects which address housing needs identified in their plans. The Home program reaches out to every community in Utah to promote affordable housing plans and to promote their program.

The CDBG program funds are all given to projects which are sponsored by communities in need. CDBG staff as well as AOG staff travel throughout the state meeting with local governments and evaluating their needs as well as providing training and education regarding the CDBG program. These training include extensive material support in the form of application guidelines and manuals. CDBG manuals have very detailed specifics regarding requirements for the use and tracking of funds including a timeline with outlined deadlines. Rural communities in Utah have a developed knowledge of the CDBG program and know how the program works and who to be contacted.

The board for the various HUD programs all have members who represent local government. These members represent the interests of local governments in making decisions regarding the use of program funds.

Narrative (optional):

PR-15 Citizen Participation - 91.115, 91.300(c)

1. Summary of citizen participation process/Efforts made to broaden citizen participation Summarize citizen participation process and how it impacted goal-setting

HCD works with seven regional Association of Governments (AOGs) to conduct citizen outreach and gather information for the state Consolidated Plan. Each AOG's Consolidated Plan details a process for outreach and citizen participation. A review of these plans show that each of the seven local planning agencies has made a concerted effort to seek public input into their planning, priority, and funding processes through mailings, questionnaires, forums, web posting, and public noticed hearings. A 30-day comment period has been adhered to by each agency.

Those public comment periods (for regional plans) ended by March 2, 2015 and comments were forwarded to HCD with each area's Consolidated Plan update and action plan for 2014-15.

Workshops intended to explain the application process and how to successfully apply for CDBG funds, are held in October of each year in order to give applicants sufficient time to complete their application for the next funding cycle. Also, applicants hold public hearings to solicit input from local residents regarding projects in their area. So every project has been presented to local citizens.

At the state level, HCD has adopted a Public Participation Plan. In adherence to this plan, the process and scheduled meetings for public input and comment have been advertised and were held in accordance with Utah's Open Public Meeting Law and have been posted to the Utah Public Notice Website (<http://www.utah.gov/pmn/index.html>). Concurrent to that posting, the draft is posted to the HCD website (<http://jobs.utah.gov/housing>), and citizens and other public and private entities were invited to contact staff with comments and questions. The state 30-day comment period began April 1 and the state has submitted the 2015 Consolidated Plan on May 1 2015. The formal public hearing was held at the HCD offices on May 1 at our location at 1385 S State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. This meeting was publicized in accordance with Utah's Open Public Meeting Law (UT Code § 52-4-101). This meeting is noticed statewide each year with electronic access to rural and remote areas upon request. Comments received at the hearings are posted and incorporated into the final draft plan. The State will provide a timely, substantive written response to every citizen complaint, within 15 days, were practicable.

Citizen Participation Outreach

Sort Order	Mode of Outreach	Target of Outreach	Summary of response/attendance	Summary of comments received	Summary of comments not accepted and reasons	URL (If applicable)
1	Public Meeting	Non-targeted/broad community	No Attendance	No Comments	Not Applicable	
2	Internet Outreach	Non-targeted/broad community	No Attendance	No Comments	Not Applicable	
3	Newspaper Ad	Non-targeted/broad community	No Attendance	No Comments	Not Applicable	

Table 4 – Citizen Participation Outreach

Needs Assessment

NA-05 Overview

Needs Assessment Overview

The Needs Assessment of the Consolidated Plan, in conjunction with information gathered through consultations and the citizen participation process, provide a picture of a HCD's needs related to affordable housing, special needs housing, community development, and homelessness. From this Needs Assessment, HCD will identify those needs with the highest priority, which will form the basis for the Strategic Plan and the programs and projects to be administered.

Most of the data tables in this section will be populated with default data based on the most recent data available.

NA-10 Housing Needs Assessment - 24 CFR 91.305 (a,b,c)

Summary of Housing Needs

Affordable and safe housing is needed in Utah. To accomplish this goal new affordable housing is needed, and existing affordable housing needs to be rehabilitated to ensure safety for low income residents. The need for affordable housing exists for all major population groups including large and small families, single individuals, single parent families, homeless individuals and persons at all low income levels, especially those in poverty.

Demographics	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2010	% Change
Population	2,233,169	2,657,236	19%
Households	701,281	859,158	23%
Median Income	\$45,726.00	\$56,330.00	23%

Table 5 - Housing Needs Assessment Demographics

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2006-2010 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Number of Households Table

	0-30% HAMFI	>30-50% HAMFI	>50-80% HAMFI	>80-100% HAMFI	>100% HAMFI
Total Households *	78,255	87,365	156,175	105,235	432,130
Small Family Households *	26,085	31,460	64,130	45,705	228,495
Large Family Households *	7,700	13,110	29,475	22,555	81,885
Household contains at least one person 62-74 years of age	10,180	12,320	20,960	14,455	65,025
Household contains at least one person age 75 or older	10,430	14,215	17,225	8,675	24,110
Households with one or more children 6 years old or younger *	18,205	23,595	49,115	32,900	73,575

* the highest income category for these family types is >80% HAMFI

Table 6 - Total Households Table

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

Housing Needs Summary Tables

1. Housing Problems (Households with one of the listed needs)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Substandard Housing - Lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities	1,290	775	575	200	2,840	330	190	430	305	1,255
Severely Overcrowded - With >1.51 people per room (and complete kitchen and plumbing)	620	555	880	315	2,370	145	180	450	305	1,080
Overcrowded - With 1.01-1.5 people per room (and none of the above problems)	3,130	3,570	3,660	1,545	11,905	645	1,510	2,965	1,985	7,105
Housing cost burden greater than 50% of income (and none of the above problems)	30,100	10,405	1,975	235	42,715	15,390	13,910	13,580	3,805	46,685
Housing cost burden greater than 30% of income (and none of the above problems)	5,340	20,740	18,420	2,530	47,030	4,730	9,115	31,610	21,875	67,330

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total
Zero/negative Income (and none of the above problems)	3,085	0	0	0	3,085	2,460	0	0	0	2,460

Table 7 – Housing Problems Table

Data 2006-2010 CHAS
Source:

2. Housing Problems 2 (Households with one or more Severe Housing Problems: Lacks kitchen or complete plumbing, severe overcrowding, severe cost burden)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30- 50% AMI	>50- 80% AMI	>80- 100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Having 1 or more of four housing problems	35,140	15,300	7,085	2,290	59,815	16,510	15,785	17,425	6,400	56,120
Having none of four housing problems	12,370	30,460	54,535	27,375	124,740	8,685	25,815	77,130	69,170	180,800
Household has negative income, but none of the other housing problems	3,085	0	0	0	3,085	2,460	0	0	0	2,460

Table 8 – Housing Problems 2

Data 2006-2010 CHAS
Source:

3. Cost Burden > 30%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	16,705	15,685	9,280	41,670	5,365	8,260	21,345	34,970
Large Related	3,680	4,540	2,990	11,210	2,755	6,170	12,085	21,010
Elderly	4,535	4,290	2,135	10,960	8,370	6,575	6,675	21,620
Other	14,825	9,900	7,005	31,730	4,285	3,285	6,460	14,030
Total need by income	39,745	34,415	21,410	95,570	20,775	24,290	46,565	91,630

Table 9 – Cost Burden > 30%

Data 2006-2010 CHAS
Source:

4. Cost Burden > 50%

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS								
Small Related	14,240	4,220	615	19,075	4,735	5,450	6,590	16,775
Large Related	3,055	1,380	365	4,800	2,625	3,660	2,575	8,860
Elderly	3,590	1,765	525	5,880	5,190	2,980	2,480	10,650
Other	12,625	3,880	665	17,170	3,415	2,320	2,145	7,880
Total need by income	33,510	11,245	2,170	46,925	15,965	14,410	13,790	44,165

Table 10 – Cost Burden > 50%

Data 2006-2010 CHAS
Source:

5. Crowding (More than one person per room)

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS										
Single family households	3,075	3,540	3,650	1,365	11,630	745	1,430	2,765	1,685	6,625
Multiple, unrelated family households	290	240	510	220	1,260	75	265	645	630	1,615

	Renter					Owner				
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	>80-100% AMI	Total
Other, non-family households	405	365	460	275	1,505	4	0	25	0	29
Total need by income	3,770	4,145	4,620	1,860	14,395	824	1,695	3,435	2,315	8,269

Table 11 – Crowding Information – 1/2

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

	Renter				Owner			
	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total	0-30% AMI	>30-50% AMI	>50-80% AMI	Total
Households with Children Present	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 12 – Crowding Information – 2/2

Data Source:
Comments:

Describe the number and type of single person households in need of housing assistance.

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance who are disabled or victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

The State of Utah ESG program as well as the HOME and CDBG program assist in the housing of victims of domestic violence. In the latest point-in-time count 1091 persons identified themselves as victims of domestic violence. The ESG program estimate that the true number of victims in needs of housing assistance during the course of a year is approximately five times that number or 5455. Most of these are individuals or single mother households who are in need. This is the best information we have on that special needs population. Regarding disability, the numbers on disability as reported by the US census have been contested as being inaccurate and reliable quantitative data does not exist. Members of the disabled community have expressed that there is a great need for accessible units and have complained that requirements regarding disabled units are not being properly met by property managers. This is addressed in the impediments to fair housing.

What are the most common housing problems?

The most common housing problems relate to housing cost burden in relation to income. There are 42,715 households renting that have greater than 50% of their income is allocated towards housing costs. Another 47,030 renting households have a housing cost burden greater than 30% of their income. Additionally, of those who own their place of residence, 46,685 have a housing cost greater than 50% of their income and 67,330 have a housing cost burden greater than 30% of their income. When these figures are considered cumulatively, 89,400 (10.4% of total households) of Utah households have greater than 50% of their income going towards housing and 114,360 (13.3% of total households) greater than 30%. When housing costs account for the majority of a household income there is far less likelihood of financial reserves for future monetary crises which could may increase housing instability and the possibility of homelessness.

Are any populations/household types more affected than others by these problems?

Those households with lower incomes are affected more by the housing problems. Of those in the jurisdiction as a whole with 0%-30% of area median income, 84% of them have at least one or more housing problem and 69% has one more "severe housing problem". When compared to those who are within 80%-100% of area median income where only 30% of the households have a housing problem and 8% have a "severe housing problem". Additionally, the percentage of certain races affected within each income grouping is disproportionate to others. As seen in the 0%-30% AMI range, only 79.7% of American Indian, Alaskan Natives and 83% of all white households in this range have a housing problem, whereas 86% of African American, 88% of Asian, 90% of Hispanic and 100% of Pacific Islander households have at least one housing problem. This difference contingent upon race carries through on all income ranges and housing problem severity.

Describe the characteristics and needs of Low-income individuals and families with children (especially extremely low-income) who are currently housed but are at imminent risk of either residing in shelters or becoming unsheltered 91.205(c)/91.305(c)). Also discuss the needs of formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance and are nearing the termination of that assistance

Households with low and extremely low incomes have an increased probability of having a greater percentage of their income going towards their housing. This leaves less of their already limited income available to address incidentals and crises as they arise. This lack of or inability to set aside financial reserves leaves many households near eviction and homelessness. Additional characteristics may include job loss, mental illness, disabling conditions, decreasing health, divorce, garnishments in wages, single income households, substance abuse, domestic violence, "doubling up", underemployment, lack of or unreliable transportation, no access to affordable child care, and many other factor that create a disengagement between what one needs to be sustained in housing and what one has.

The families and individuals who have utilized rapid re-housing and are now nearing termination will need to have a system of supports and resources to draw from. As they are once again assuming the full responsibility of their housing they will need a form of steady income, an emergency fund or at least a

plan on how to get one, and to have been given the tools to address the cause of their previous homelessness. They will need to be in a unit that is sustainable and appropriate.

If a jurisdiction provides estimates of the at-risk population(s), it should also include a description of the operational definition of the at-risk group and the methodology used to generate the estimates:

The State of Utah does not provide estimates of the at-risk populations, but does adhere to the Housing and Urban Development definition for “At-Risk populations”. This policy is as follows:

Category (1) are individuals and families with annual incomes below 30% of the AMI, who have no sufficient resources or support networks immediately available for prevent them from moving to an emergency shelter or another place and meet one of the following conditions: (1) have moved 2 or more times 60 days immediately preceding an application for assistance; (2) are living in the home of another because of economic hardship; (3) have been notified their current living situation will be terminated within 21 days after the date of the application for assistance; (4) live in a hotel or motel with the cost not being paid by charitable, Federal, state, or local low income program; (5) live in an SRO or efficiency unit with 2 more persons in a large unit or 1 and half persons per room; or (6) are exiting a publically funded institutional system of care.

Category (2) lists at-risk as being an unaccompanied youth or child who does not qualify as homeless under HUD's homeless definition, but does under another Federal statute.

Category (3) is an unaccompanied youth that qualify as homeless under section 725(2) of the McKinney - Vento Homeless Act and the parent/guardian who lives with that youth.

Specify particular housing characteristics that have been linked with instability and an increased risk of homelessness

The number of affordable housing units in relation to low income individuals in need of affordable housing has created instability. The need is greater than what is available. Increased access to units that could be sustained on a lower income without a problematic housing burden could increase housing stability.

The 2014 Comprehensive report on homelessness states that, “Utah’s growing economy and dropping unemployment rate stand in contrast to the expansion of the population in poverty. A tight housing market combined with an increase in the number of renters unable to afford fair market rent will make it more difficult for low-income persons to find stable housing,” and concludes, “The combination of a lack of affordable housing, poverty, unemployment, and a lack of health insurance makes people more vulnerable to becoming homeless in the event of a crisis, particularly with a lack of affordable and available housing.”

Discussion

NA-15 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Problems - 91.305 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole.¹² For example, assume that 60% of all low-income households within a jurisdiction have a housing problem and 70% of low-income Hispanic households have a housing problem. In this case, low-income Hispanic households have a disproportionately greater need. Per the regulations at 91.205(b)(2), 91.305(b)(2), and 91.405, a grantee must provide an assessment for each disproportionately greater need identified. Although the purpose of these tables is to analyze the relative level of need for each race and ethnic category, the data also provide information for the jurisdiction as a whole that can be useful in describing overall need.

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	59,937	11,136	5,193
White	45,481	9,317	3,765
Black / African American	1,023	155	110
Asian	1,662	207	383
American Indian, Alaska Native	1,322	336	200
Pacific Islander	279	0	55
Hispanic	9,306	1,022	615

Table 13 - Disproportionally Greater Need 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	58,343	27,921	0
White	44,375	24,074	0
Black / African American	890	131	0
Asian	776	428	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	815	373	0
Pacific Islander	647	8	0
Hispanic	10,233	2,738	0

Table 14 - Disproportionally Greater Need 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	71,643	86,886	0
White	57,363	73,607	0
Black / African American	929	724	0
Asian	1,078	1,367	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	972	835	0
Pacific Islander	776	454	0
Hispanic	9,993	9,414	0

Table 15 - Disproportionally Greater Need 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Housing Problems	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	31,081	74,269	0
White	26,648	64,372	0
Black / African American	174	439	0
Asian	681	1,339	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	171	645	0
Pacific Islander	154	237	0
Hispanic	2,936	6,649	0

Table 16 - Disproportionally Greater Need 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than one person per room, 4. Cost Burden greater than 30%

Discussion

As might be expected, those at lower income levels, especially those who are at extremely low income levels, are more likely to be living in substandard living conditions. This highlights the need for the rehabilitation of affordable housing not only in regards to state funded properties, but also in the private marketplace.

Regarding the differences between the racial and ethnic categories list; the minorities, especially blacks and american indians, have a much higher probability, even within their own income bracket, of having substandard housing.

NA-20 Disproportionately Greater Need: Severe Housing Problems – 91.305(b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. For example, assume that 60% of all low-income households within a jurisdiction have a housing problem and 70% of low-income Hispanic households have a housing problem. In this case, low-income Hispanic households have a disproportionately greater need. Per the regulations at 91.205(b)(2), 91.305(b)(2), and 91.405, a grantee must provide an assessment for each disproportionately greater need identified.

Severe housing problems include:

Overcrowded households with more than 1.5 persons per room, not including bathrooms, porches, foyers, halls, or half-rooms,

Households with cost burdens of more than 50 percent of income

0%-30% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	49,207	21,800	5,193
White	36,636	18,085	3,765
Black / African American	984	194	110
Asian	1,507	366	383
American Indian, Alaska Native	1,084	559	200
Pacific Islander	255	24	55
Hispanic	7,924	2,369	615

Table 17 – Severe Housing Problems 0 - 30% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

30%-50% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	28,072	58,181	0
White	20,383	48,054	0
Black / African American	465	562	0
Asian	353	861	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	502	705	0
Pacific Islander	383	273	0
Hispanic	5,736	7,255	0

Table 18 – Severe Housing Problems 30 - 50% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

50%-80% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	22,468	136,005	0
White	16,831	114,085	0
Black / African American	369	1,279	0
Asian	407	2,023	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	477	1,335	0
Pacific Islander	372	858	0
Hispanic	3,865	15,610	0

Table 19 – Severe Housing Problems 50 - 80% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

80%-100% of Area Median Income

Severe Housing Problems*	Has one or more of four housing problems	Has none of the four housing problems	Household has no/negative income, but none of the other housing problems
Jurisdiction as a whole	7,956	97,398	0
White	5,969	85,056	0
Black / African American	35	584	0
Asian	178	1,848	0
American Indian, Alaska Native	107	709	0
Pacific Islander	105	286	0
Hispanic	1,480	8,089	0

Table 20 – Severe Housing Problems 80 - 100% AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

*The four severe housing problems are:

1. Lacks complete kitchen facilities, 2. Lacks complete plumbing facilities, 3. More than 1.5 persons per room, 4. Cost Burden over 50%

Discussion

As might be expected, those at lower income levels, especially those who are at extremely low income levels, are more likely to be living in substandard living conditions. This highlights the need for the rehabilitation of affordable housing not only in regards to state funded properties, but also in the private marketplace.

Regarding the differences between the racial and ethnic categories list; the minorities, especially blacks and american indians, have a much higher probability, even within their own income bracket, of having substandard housing.

NA-25 Disproportionately Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens – 91.305 (b)(2)

Assess the need of any racial or ethnic group that has disproportionately greater need in comparison to the needs of that category of need as a whole.

Introduction

A disproportionately greater need exists when the members of racial or ethnic group at a given income level experience housing problems at a greater rate (10 percentage points or more) than the income level as a whole. For example, assume that 60% of all low-income households within a jurisdiction have a housing problem and 70% of low-income Hispanic households have a housing problem. In this case, low-income Hispanic households have a disproportionately greater need. Per the regulations at 91.205(b)(2), 91.305(b)(2), and 91.405, a grantee must provide an assessment for each disproportionately greater need identified.

Housing Cost Burden

Housing Cost Burden	<=30%	30-50%	>50%	No / negative income (not computed)
Jurisdiction as a whole	580,524	153,087	92,600	5,447
White	514,275	127,946	73,367	3,870
Black / African American	3,465	1,596	1,533	125
Asian	9,725	2,407	2,091	397
American Indian, Alaska Native	5,546	1,267	1,231	270
Pacific Islander	2,334	1,087	602	55
Hispanic	41,214	17,401	12,670	654

Table 21 – Greater Need: Housing Cost Burdens AMI

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

Discussion

According to the information provided by HUD there are three ethnic or racial categories which are disproportionately likely to be housing cost burdened. These groups are Blacks, Pacific Islanders and Hispanics. These racial groups are more than 10% more likely to be cost burdened. Almost half of the Blacks in this data group are cost burdened and more than twice the norm have a severe (over 50%) housing cost burden.

NA-30 Disproportionately Greater Need: Discussion – 91.305 (b)(2)

Are there any Income categories in which a racial or ethnic group has disproportionately greater need than the needs of that income category as a whole?

Blacks, Native Americans, Hispanics, and Pacific Islanders all have disproportionately greater needs than the needs of their respective income categories as a whole. There is not enough information to determine why they live in worse conditions than other racial categories whose income levels are comparable to their own.

If they have needs not identified above, what are those needs?

Other needs have not been identified at this time.

Are any of those racial or ethnic groups located in specific areas or neighborhoods in your community?

HCD HOME, ESG, and HOPWA Programs operate throughout the state. These overlap with other entitlement programs which operate in these areas. The CDBG program operates outside of other CDBG entitlement areas and therefore is found in rural areas of the state. As a whole Utah has a largely homogenous population. This is especially true for rural areas

NA-35 Public Housing – (Optional)

Introduction

Totals in Use

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers in use	0	511	1,732	10,418	258	9,613	152	137	237

Table 22 - Public Housing by Program Type

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Characteristics of Residents

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	
# Homeless at admission	0	4	1	18	0	7	10		1
# of Elderly Program Participants (>62)	0	31	791	1,806	59	1,670	25		1
# of Disabled Families	0	184	252	4,152	131	3,728	66		28
# of Families requesting accessibility features	0	511	1,732	10,418	258	9,613	152		137

Consolidated Plan

UTAH

33

Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers				
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher	
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program
# of HIV/AIDS program participants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
# of DV victims	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 23 – Characteristics of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Race of Residents

Program Type									
Race	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
White	0	455	1,505	9,154	224	8,419	126	133	231
Black/African American	0	34	95	789	18	744	20	4	3
Asian	0	6	83	175	4	168	0	0	3
American Indian/Alaska Native	0	15	29	197	11	181	5	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	1	20	103	1	101	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition

Table 24 – Race of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Ethnicity of Residents

Ethnicity	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Program Type					
				Vouchers			Special Purpose Voucher		
				Total	Project - based	Tenant - based	Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
Hispanic	0	73	330	1,513	36	1,428	10	22	15
Not Hispanic	0	438	1,402	8,905	222	8,185	142	115	222
*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition									

Table 25 – Ethnicity of Public Housing Residents by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Section 504 Needs Assessment: Describe the needs of public housing tenants and applicants on the waiting list for accessible units:

What are the number and type of families on the waiting lists for public housing and section 8 tenant-based rental assistance? Based on the information above, and any other information available to the jurisdiction, what are the most immediate needs of residents of public housing and Housing Choice voucher holders?

How do these needs compare to the housing needs of the population at large

Discussion:

NA-40 Homeless Needs Assessment – 91.305(c)

Introduction:

Homeless Needs Assessment

Population	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Persons in Households with Only Children	1	1	1	1	1	1
Persons in Households with Only Adults	1	1	1	1	1	1
Chronically Homeless Individuals	1	1	1	1	1	1
Chronically Homeless Families	1	1	1	1	1	1
Veterans	1	1	1	1	1	1
Unaccompanied Child	1	1	1	1	1	1
Persons with HIV	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 26 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Data Source Comments:

Indicate if the homeless population is: Partially Rural Homeless

Rural Homeless Needs Assessment

Population	Estimate the # of persons experiencing homelessness on a given night		Estimate the # experiencing homelessness each year	Estimate the # becoming homeless each year	Estimate the # exiting homelessness each year	Estimate the # of days persons experience homelessness
	Sheltered	Unsheltered				
Persons in Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Persons in Households with Only Children	1	1	1	1	1	1
Persons in Households with Only Adults	1	1	1	1	1	1
Chronically Homeless Individuals	1	1	1	1	1	1
Chronically Homeless Families	1	1	1	1	1	1
Veterans	1	1	1	1	1	1
Unaccompanied Youth	1	1	1	1	1	1
Persons with HIV	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 27 - Homeless Needs Assessment

Data Source Comments:

For persons in rural areas who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, describe the nature and extent of unsheltered and sheltered homelessness with the jurisdiction:

There are relatively few rural homeless.

If data is not available for the categories "number of persons becoming and exiting homelessness each year," and "number of days that persons experience homelessness," describe these categories for each homeless population type (including chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth):

Data pulled from the Utah Homeless Management Information System indicate that 5,996 persons had their first entry into HMIS and were enrolled in emergency shelter, safe haven and transitional housing in 2014 and became homeless. 9,973 people were enrolled in emergency shelter, safe haven, and transitional housing projects but have been exited from these programs. It is also shown that the median number of days for persons with these enrollments is 33 days.

Nature and Extent of Homelessness: (Optional)

Race:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
White	1,399	293
Black or African American	156	5
Asian	24	2
American Indian or Alaska Native	106	12
Pacific Islander	22	1
Ethnicity:	Sheltered:	Unsheltered (optional)
Hispanic	1,332	285
Not Hispanic	429	28

Data Source

Comments:

Information gathered from Utah HMIS Database

Estimate the number and type of families in need of housing assistance for families with children and the families of veterans.

The 2014 point in time data indicated there were 398 households with at least one adult and one minor. The 398 households are comprised of 1,352 individuals. Based on this data, the annualized number of homeless households is 1,990 comprised of 6,312 individuals. The 2014 Comprehensive Report on Homelessness relates that 80% of households experiencing homelessness are able to leave homelessness without a housing placement. Following this report, we can estimate that about 398 households will require housing assistance.

Though there were 317 homeless veterans none of them were in households with at least one adult and one minor.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Homelessness by Racial and Ethnic Group.

There are some racial groups who are disproportionately represented in the homeless population when compared to state population. The largest examples of this are the “black or African American” and “American Indian or Alaska Native” races. Conversely, the “White” population is underrepresented in the homeless population when compared to state population.

Describe the Nature and Extent of Unsheltered and Sheltered Homelessness.

2014 point in time count indicates that there were 2,744 sheltered individuals and 313 unsheltered individuals throughout the State of Utah. The total number of sheltered and unsheltered homeless that day was 3,057. This constitutes .1% of Utah’s population according 2010 census information. Of those

sheltered, 1,513 were persons in households with no children, 1,228 were persons in households with children, and 3 were persons in households with only children. In the unsheltered populous 189 were persons in households with no children and 124 were persons in households with children.

When these figures are annualized we find a total of 12,685 sheltered individuals and 986 unsheltered individuals. For full figures and methodology see: <http://utahhmis.org/reports/trends-in-homelessness/>

Discussion:

NA-45 Non-Homeless Special Needs Assessment – 91.305 (b,d)

Introduction

Special needs individuals are persons who are not homeless but require supportive housing. This includes but is not limited to: elderly (62 and older), persons with mental, physical, and or developmental disabilities, persons with alcohol, or other drug additions, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, and victims of domestic violence.

HOPWA

Current HOPWA formula use:	
Cumulative cases of AIDS reported	671
Area incidence of AIDS	18
Rate per population	1
Number of new cases prior year (3 years of data)	60
Rate per population (3 years of data)	1
Current HIV surveillance data:	
Number of Persons living with HIV (PLWH)	576
Area Prevalence (PLWH per population)	34
Number of new HIV cases reported last year	0

Table 28 – HOPWA Data

Data Source: CDC HIV Surveillance

HIV Housing Need (HOPWA Grantees Only)

Type of HOPWA Assistance	Estimates of Unmet Need
Tenant based rental assistance	12
Short-term Rent, Mortgage, and Utility	24
Facility Based Housing (Permanent, short-term or transitional)	10

Table 29 – HIV Housing Need

Data Source: HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet

Describe the characteristics of special needs populations in your community:

Two challenges experienced are based on inherent challenges of housing in rural areas and an overall lack of referrals: (SLCAP) served clients south of the Tri County area (Tooele, Salt Lake, and Summit Counties). Most of this area is rural and it is sometimes difficult to acquire all the paperwork necessary from long distances with a lack of services (fax machines, etc.) Also, clients must travel long distances to receive care and that is sometimes a barrier. Another significant challenge is the lack of referrals.

This is identified by project sponsors as one of the reason for not meeting agency goals. The lack of referrals contributes to the gaps as well as limited support for education and outreach activities. Rural clients continue to express concern regarding fear of discrimination, both for HIV status and sexual orientation. To counter the fear, multiple assurances of confidentiality are required. If a resident's medical condition is made known and discrimination occurs, Project Sponsors provide information about how to report discrimination. There are also logistical challenges to rural clients, where transportation and communication are often more difficult.

Previous evictions, poor credit histories and criminal backgrounds make it extremely difficult for most needy clients in finding affordable housing. A tight housing vacancy rate has allowed landlords to be more selective, while increasing rental costs. The crime-free addendum that most Utah apartment complexes are beginning to use will not allow anyone with a felon background to rent—it is unfortunate although while trying to work with managers, but if a person continues to have arrest problems, assistance may be better provided in jail.

Housing affordability is an apparent nationwide problem. The HIV/AIDS Housing Steering Committee works together to address this type of issue. Project Sponsors have been monitoring the cost of rental units and making adjustments to the voucher payment standard as needed.

What are the housing and supportive service needs of these populations and how are these needs determined?

HCD encourages project sponsors to work closely with the University of Utah Clinic 1A and the Utah AIDS Foundation to receive referrals to provide eligible HOPWA clients with housing assistance and case management. These two entities are a main source of client referral. The coordination between referral and agencies with HOPWA subsidy is proving to be beneficial. Accordingly, every eligible household referred to HOPWA Project Sponsors receive financial assistance when needed, which allowed them to remain in their current housing, pay utilities, or obtain the first month's rent and/or deposit to move into safe, sanitary housing.

HCD continues to address the referral issues and need to collaborate has made a significant contribution. HCD has expanded statewide outreach and services and met with all program stakeholders to address better ways to meet the gap in outreach, education and referral. Two challenges experienced are based on inherent challenges of housing in rural areas and an overall lack of referrals: (SLCAP) served clients south of the Tri County area (Tooele, Salt Lake, and Summit Counties). Most of this area is rural and it is sometimes difficult to acquire all the paperwork necessary from long distances with a lack of services (fax machines, etc.) Also, clients must travel long distances to receive care and that is sometimes a barrier. Another significant challenge is the lack of referrals. This is identified by project sponsors as one of the reason for not meeting agency goals. The lack of referrals contributes to the gaps as well as limited support for education and outreach activities.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Housing prices in Weber County has increased over the last few years, but Ogden Housing Authority tries to get as many clients on the HOPWA voucher. For those that do not qualify or choose not to obtain a HOPWA voucher, agencies would look for quality low cost housing through with landlords with whom they have worked in the past.

CREDIT HISTORY

Some of the HOPWA clients struggle with credit and debt issues. They are being referred to attend financial classes to help with their credit and debt situation to achieve financial stability.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

Some of the HOPWA clients that are not able to obtain subsidized housing due to their criminal history, the agencies would work with local landlords to help secure housing. The long standing barriers remain despite of the rental market and rent charges starting to turn around with availability of suitable units. The biggest barrier currently encountered is still the ineligibility of some clients to rent safe, decent, affordable housing units. Most of the HOPWA clients have problems with credit history, some of them with rental history, and a few with criminal history. Cities encourage the use of programs, such as the good landlord program, which caused the landlords to turn away from renters that are somewhat sub par, or would require more of a risk. Therefore, the landlords who are still willing to overlook these past behaviors are charging higher rents, and asking significantly larger deposits. This has put a strain on the HOPWA clients, housing staff, and case managers as they try to find safe, decent affordable units.

OTHER BARRIERS: The ability to obtain required documents i.e. social security cards, birth certificates, etc. can be a barrier due to lack of income or resources. Pre-screening fees and deposits can also be a barrier for clients. Additionally client's criminal history, credit and rental history may prevent clients from being able to transition to other rental assistance programs. This prevents us from being able to transition clients to other programs which would allow us to assist other clients in need of the HOPWA Program.

Discuss the size and characteristics of the population with HIV/AIDS and their families within the Eligible Metropolitan Statistical Area:

According to the information provided by HUD there are currently 671 persons with AIDS living in Utah at this time and 576 who have HIV. According to the estimates derived by HUD there is an unmet need for 12 Tenant-Based Rental Assistance Vouchers, 24 households needing short term rent, mortgage or utility assistance, and 10 needing facility based housing assistance.

Discussion:

NA-50 Non-Housing Community Development Needs - 91.315 (f)

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Facilities:

The Utah State Small Cities CDBG program is the only HCD program whose funds are able to address non-housing community development needs. Each Regional AOG have assessed the need for public facilities. While giving a full accounting of there assessment is not possible in this space, HCD will give a brief summary and encourage the reader to access the AOG Consolidated Plans for a more detailed report.

How were these needs determined?

Each of the regional AOGs conducts their own needs assessment on an annual basis. They do this by going out into the communities they serve and meet with local officials to complete an needs assessment. This process includes conducting a review of existing facilities and whether these facilities are adequate to meet community needs. This need assessment is also conducted on behalf of counties which are eligible for CDBG assistance.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Improvements:

The Utah State Small Cities CDBG program is the only HCD program whose funds are able to address non-housing community development needs. Each Regional AOG have assessed the need for public facilities. While giving a full accounting of there assessment is not possible in this space, HCD will give a brief summary and encourage the reader to access the AOG Consolidated Plans for a more detailed report.

How were these needs determined?

Each of the regional AOGs conducts their own needs assessment on an annual basis. They do this by going out into the communities they serve and meet with local officials to complete an assessment determining needs. This process includes conducting a review of public infrastructure needs and whether they are adequate to meet community needs. This needs assessment is also conducted on behalf of counties which are eligible for CDBG assistance.

Describe the jurisdiction's need for Public Services:

The Utah State Small Cities CDBG program is the only HCD program whose funds are able to address non-housing community development needs. Each Regional AOG have assessed the need for public facilities. While giving a full accounting of there assessment is not possible in this space, HCD will give a

brief summary and encourage the reader to access the AOG Consolidated Plans for a more detailed report.

How were these needs determined?

Each of the regional AOGs conducts their own needs assessment on an annual basis. They do this by going out into the communities they serve and meet with local officials to complete an assessment determining needs. This process includes conducting a review of public services and whether the available services are adequate to meet community needs. This needs assessment is also conducted on behalf of counties which are eligible for CDBG assistance.

Housing Market Analysis

MA-05 Overview

Housing Market Analysis Overview:

The purpose of the Market Analysis is to provide a clear picture of the environment in which HCd will administer its programs over the course of the Consolidated Plan. In conjunction with the Needs Assessment, the Market Analysis will provide the basis for the Strategic Plan and the programs and projects to be administered.

Most of the data tables in this section will be pre-populated with a default data set based on the most recent data available.

MA-10 Number of Housing Units – 91.310(a)

Introduction

This section details the supply of housing currently in the market" and includes an look at rental properties by number of units and the unit size by tenure.

All residential properties by number of units

Property Type	Number	%
1-unit detached structure	656,542	69%
1-unit, attached structure	53,335	6%
2-4 units	73,573	8%
5-19 units	75,097	8%
20 or more units	54,403	6%
Mobile Home, boat, RV, van, etc	39,420	4%
Total	952,370	100%

Table 30 – Residential Properties by Unit Number

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Unit Size by Tenure

	Owners		Renters	
	Number	%	Number	%
No bedroom	722	0%	5,266	2%
1 bedroom	9,023	1%	49,703	20%
2 bedrooms	73,787	12%	96,772	39%
3 or more bedrooms	527,966	86%	95,919	39%
Total	611,498	99%	247,660	100%

Table 31 – Unit Size by Tenure

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Describe the number and targeting (income level/type of family served) of units assisted with federal, state, and local programs.

Utah has a very wide range of programs assisted with federal, state, and local programs. It is not possible to review the full extent of available program within the state. In this analysis HCD will focus on those programs assisted with HUD funds. The State ESG program works to provide services to the Homeless population. This includes emergency shelter and the rapid rehousing of homeless individuals. The ESG program also provides extensive services for the homeless including case management. Other community groups also assist in providing services for the homeless. The complete list can be found in the SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure segment of this plan. Low income individuals and family housing needs are primarily served by the state HOME program run by the Olene Walker Housing Loan

Fund (OWHLF). OWHLF has as its primary goal the construction of new affordable housing units. OWHLF encourages through its rating and ranking system the creation of a varies of unit sizes and the use of set asides geared towards protected classes. While there is a need for affordable single family homes, OWHLF does not fund single family properties. The state does fund using state fund a single family program which utilized the self-help model of affordable single family creation to assist households to accomplish home ownership. The rental units are geared towards a variety of income levels. OWHLF encourages lower AMI targeting through its rating and ranking system.

Provide an assessment of units expected to be lost from the affordable housing inventory for any reason, such as expiration of Section 8 contracts.

HCd does not anticipate any units will be lost from the affordable housing inventory for any reason. the reason for this is that affordable units created in Utah are require to remain affordable for many years. Most are required to remain affordable for 99 years while more recently the number has been dropped to 50. Due to this unique requirement the affordable housing inventory is very stable. Should a property experience financial difficulties, Utah has a strong record of investors stepping in to rescue a project and maintain its affordability requirement so as to keep the tax credits and other funds invested in it.

Does the availability of housing units meet the needs of the population?

The availability of housing units does not meet the needs of the low income population in Utah. Rental units in Utah have extremely low vacancy rates due to a lack of investment in rental properties. This need is greatest in Urban areas along the Wasatch Front Region.

Describe the need for specific types of housing:

Affordable housing of all types is needed in Utah. Affordable rental properties in major metropolitan areas, especially in and around public trasportation, is the highest need identified by OWHLF. OWHLF encourages the use of set asides for specific at need populations, the creation of various unit sizes, and the targeting of a variety of AMI levels. It does this through its rating and ranking system.

Discussion

MA-15 Cost of Housing – 91.310(a)

Introduction

This section details the supply of housing currently in the market and includes the following sections: cost of housing, rent paid, housing affordability, and rent tables.

Cost of Housing

	Base Year: 2000	Most Recent Year: 2010	% Change
Median Home Value	142,600	218,100	53%
Median Contract Rent	534	675	26%

Table 32 – Cost of Housing

Data Source: 2000 Census (Base Year), 2006-2010 ACS (Most Recent Year)

Rent Paid	Number	%
Less than \$500	61,772	24.9%
\$500-999	147,601	59.6%
\$1,000-1,499	29,942	12.1%
\$1,500-1,999	5,845	2.4%
\$2,000 or more	2,500	1.0%
Total	247,660	100.0%

Table 33 - Rent Paid

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Housing Affordability

% Units affordable to Households earning	Renter	Owner
30% HAMFI	14,880	No Data
50% HAMFI	60,765	18,415
80% HAMFI	159,120	87,655
100% HAMFI	No Data	178,060
Total	234,765	284,130

Table 34 – Housing Affordability

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

Monthly Rent

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
Fair Market Rent	0	0	0	0	0

Monthly Rent (\$)	Efficiency (no bedroom)	1 Bedroom	2 Bedroom	3 Bedroom	4 Bedroom
High HOME Rent	0	0	0	0	0
Low HOME Rent	0	0	0	0	0

Table 35 – Monthly Rent

Data Source Comments: There are various housing markets in Utah and completing this table cannot accurately characterize the cost of housing for Utah as a whole.

Is there sufficient housing for households at all income levels?

There is insufficient housing available at all income levels.

How is affordability of housing likely to change considering changes to home values and/or rents?

Affordability will likely decrease since the increase in home values and rents is progressing much more rapidly than the increase in personal and household income.

How do HOME rents / Fair Market Rent compare to Area Median Rent? How might this impact your strategy to produce or preserve affordable housing?

The Area Median Rent shown in the Cost of Housing table is outdated and reliable information which is more recent is not available at this time.

Discussion

MA-20 Condition of Housing – 91.310(a)

Introduction:

Definitions

Condition of Units

Condition of Units	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
With one selected Condition	165,352	27%	102,417	41%
With two selected Conditions	4,909	1%	8,972	4%
With three selected Conditions	424	0%	470	0%
With four selected Conditions	6	0%	19	0%
No selected Conditions	440,807	72%	135,782	55%
Total	611,498	100%	247,660	100%

Table 36 - Condition of Units

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Year Unit Built

Year Unit Built	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
2000 or later	125,836	21%	36,253	15%
1980-1999	205,910	34%	81,160	33%
1950-1979	210,305	34%	94,414	38%
Before 1950	69,447	11%	35,833	14%
Total	611,498	100%	247,660	100%

Table 37 – Year Unit Built

Data Source: 2006-2010 CHAS

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard

Risk of Lead-Based Paint Hazard	Owner-Occupied		Renter-Occupied	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total Number of Units Built Before 1980	279,752	46%	130,247	53%
Housing Units build before 1980 with children present	48,160	8%	309,220	125%

Table 38 – Risk of Lead-Based Paint

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS (Total Units) 2006-2010 CHAS (Units with Children present)

Vacant Units

	Suitable for Rehabilitation	Not Suitable for Rehabilitation	Total
Vacant Units			
Abandoned Vacant Units			
REO Properties			
Abandoned REO Properties			

Table 39 - Vacant Units

Need for Owner and Rental Rehabilitation

Estimated Number of Housing Units Occupied by Low or Moderate Income Families with LBP Hazards

Discussion:

MA-25 Public and Assisted Housing – (Optional)

Introduction:

Totals Number of Units

	Program Type								
	Certificate	Mod-Rehab	Public Housing	Vouchers					
				Total	Project-based	Tenant-based	Special Purpose Voucher		
							Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Family Unification Program	Disabled *
# of units vouchers available	0	522	1,785	10,870	241	6,438	1,046	1,706	3,357
# of accessible units			30						
*includes Non-Elderly Disabled, Mainstream One-Year, Mainstream Five-year, and Nursing Home Transition									

Table 40 – Total Number of Units by Program Type

Data Source: PIC (PIH Information Center)

Describe the supply of public housing developments:

Describe the number and physical condition of public housing units in the jurisdiction, including those that are participating in an approved Public Housing Agency Plan:

Describe the Restoration and Revitalization Needs of public housing units in the jurisdiction:

Describe the public housing agency's strategy for improving the living environment of low- and moderate-income families residing in public housing:

Discussion:

MA-30 Homeless Facilities – 91.310(b)

Introduction

Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

	Emergency Shelter Beds		Transitional Housing Beds	Permanent Supportive Housing Beds	
	Year Round Beds (Current & New)	Voucher / Seasonal / Overflow Beds	Current & New	Current & New	Under Development
Households with Adult(s) and Child(ren)	0	0	0	0	0
Households with Only Adults	0	0	0	0	0
Chronically Homeless Households	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans	0	0	0	0	0
Unaccompanied Youth	0	0	0	0	0

Table 41 - Facilities Targeted to Homeless Persons

Data Source Comments:

Describe mainstream services, such as health, mental health, and employment services to the extent those services are used to complement services targeted to homeless persons

The State of Utah has sought to adopt a holistic approach to addressing the issues surrounding homelessness. In order to achieve this, the state's approach to homelessness includes the incorporation of many mainstream services in homeless services. In the State of Utah's approach to addressing homelessness found in the 2014 Comprehensive Report on Homelessness, there are five main areas set forth. These five areas are:

- 1) Collective impact
- 2) Coordination of resources
- 3) Coordinated assessment
- 4) Performance measurement
- 5) Coordination of partners across systems

The results of these areas of focus are evidenced by the level of collaboration found within the communities. The Department of Workforce Services (DWS) actively engages the literally homeless through ongoing partnerships, colocation, and increased accessibility. DWS has employment specialists on site in shelters, clinics for the homeless, and permanent supportive housing units that seek to align SNAP, Medicaid, and employment services to homeless persons. This partnership and presence enables case managers to effectively refer and follow up with providers to ensure households experiencing homelessness are lined up with these services. There are also representatives trained in SSI/SSDI Outreach, Access, and Recovery (SOAR) within several governmental and non-profit entities aimed towards assisting in the applications for SSI/SSDI. The State of Utah is participating in the Healthcare and Housing (H2) initiative in order to strengthen linkages between housing and healthcare for participants of HUD-assisted housing on a systems level. In line with this, the state has received a Cooperative Agreement to Benefit Homeless Individuals (CABHI) grant and a Grant for the Benefit of Homeless Individuals (GBHI) Program. Both of these grants are aimed at aligning people experiencing homelessness who have mental illness, substance abuse disorders, or both with treatment, housing, and other mainstream services. Finally, a major goal of case managers in housing programs is to increase the access to mainstream benefits for their clients in order to maximize the services and supports needed to maintain housing and overall wellbeing.

List and describe services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons, particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth. If the services and facilities are listed on screen SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure or screen MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services, describe how these facilities and services specifically address the needs of these populations.

Balance of State Continuum of Care

Bear River AOG– TH and RRH through TANF and PAHTF

Canyon Creek Women's Crisis Center– DV shelter and TH

Citizens Against Physical and Sexual Abuse– DV shelter and TH

Colleen Quigley Women’s Shelter– DV shelter

Davis Behavioral Health Inc– PSH, some for chronic

Davis County Citizens Coalition Against Violence– DV, ES and TH

DOVE Center– DV shelter

Erin Kimball Foundation– DV, TH

Family Connection Center– Motel Vouchers and RRH through ESG and COC

Five County AOG– RRH through PAHTF and SSBG

Four Corners Community Behavioral Health– PSH, some for chronic

Homeless Veteran Fellowship– RRH through SSVF, PSH, and TH

Housing Authority of the City of Ogden– S+C vouchers and HUD-VASH vouchers

Iron County Care and Share– ES, RRH through TANF/ESG, and PSH

New Hope– DV ES and TH

New Horizons– DV ES and TH

Ogden Rescue Mission– ES

Safe Haven– DV shelter

Six County AOG– Hotel vouchers

Southeastern Utah ALG– RRH through TANF

Southwest Behavioral Health Center– PSH, some chronic

St. Anne’s Center– On site ES, meals and ESG RRH

St. George Housing Authority– HUD-VASH vouchers

Switchpoint– ES and RRH

Uintah Basin AOG–hotel vouchers, TH, and TANF RRH

Uintah County– Turning point ES

Weber Housing Authority– PSH and S+C

Your Community Connection– DV ES, TH and TANF RRH

MA-35 Special Needs Facilities and Services – 91.310(c)

Introduction

HOPWA Assistance Baseline Table

Type of HOWA Assistance	Number of Units Designated or Available for People with HIV/AIDS and their families
TBRA	8
PH in facilities	8
STRMU	19
ST or TH facilities	5
PH placement	2

Table 42 – HOPWA Assistance Baseline

Data Source: HOPWA CAPER and HOPWA Beneficiary Verification Worksheet

To the extent information is available, describe the facilities and services that assist persons who are not homeless but who require supportive housing, and programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

Salt Lake/Tooele COC

Asian Association of Utah– RRH services

Catholic Community Services– day/walk-in center for homeless and daily meals served. St. Mary’s for Recovery 40 veterans in a GPD program

Family Promise Salt Lake– ES and RRH services through ESG

Family Support Center– 78 PSH beds, 64 TH beds

First Step House– 18 GPD beds.

Fourth Street Clinic– Healthcare to homeless persons.

HASLC

Valor Apartments– 14 GPD beds

Valor House– 72 GPD beds

S+C (S+C)– 160 vouchers

Freedom Landing– 61 GPD beds and 48 beds of project based HUD-VASH

Sunrise Metro– 20 GPD beds and 80 PSH units to chronic.

HUD-VASH– 150 vouchers

HACSL

Kelly Benson– 48 PSH units for chronic

Bud Bailey– 10 youth focused PSH beds, of which 6 are chronic, and 24 beds of PSH for chronic families.

S+C vouchers

COC Leasing

COC master leasing

HUD-VASH vouchers

Grace Mary Manor – Provides PSH for 84 chronic

Rescue Mission of SL– ES and TH to individual men

Salt Lake Community Action Program– Homeless prevention and RRH through TANF, ESG, TBRA

Salt Lake County Youth Services– ES and TH for youths.

South Valley Services– DV shelter

The Road Home – Provides the following services and facilities that meet the needs of homeless persons:

ES

Street Outreach

SSVF

RRH through TANF, ESG

Provides project based TH and TBRA.

Palmer Court– Chronic housing for families and individuals

Frontier Apartments – 22 beds

Housing for Individuals (HiFI) – Chronic housing first program

Wendell Apartments – Chronic housing facility

Tooele County Housing Authority – S+C for chronic persons

Utah Non-Profit Housing – PSH

Valley Behavioral Health – ES, TH, PSH and RRH through ESG and TANF

Volunteers of America

Center for Women and Children Emergency Housing

Street outreach and engagement

Chronic Homeless Project

Homeless Youth Female Transition Home

Young Men’s Transition Home

Center for Women and Children Transition Home

West Valley City HA– S+C

YWCA Salt Lake– DV ES and PSH

Mountainland COC

Center for Women and Children in Crisis– DV shelter, TH

Community Action Services and Food Bank Provo– Motel vouchers, RRH through TANF/ESG, and PSH

Food and Care Coalition– ES, TH, motel vouchers and meals are served.

Golden Spike– REAP program and TH

Housing Authority of Utah County– Housing Assistance for Homeless

Mountainlands Community Housing Trust– PSH for chronic and TH

Provo City Housing Authority– PSH for chronic/non-chronic persons and S+C

Wasatch Mental Health– Motel vouchers, street outreach, youth ES and mental health services

Describe programs for ensuring that persons returning from mental and physical health institutions receive appropriate supportive housing

Intermountain Healthcare (IHC) is one of the largest hospital systems in the State and is an active participant in the State Homeless Coordinating Committee. IHC discharge policies require initiation of a discharge plan for every patient upon admission. 4th Street Clinic, a medical facility that provides healthcare exclusively to homeless persons based out of Salt Lake City, serves the Wasatch Front and provides in-service training to the hospitals, in connection with the medical outreach team, to ensure that hospitals have safe discharge plan. Hospitals are able to contact 4th Street who then align patients with housing options through The Road Home, St. Anne's, Rescue Mission, or other geographically relevant shelters. TriCounty Services coordinates with local providers to ensure individuals being discharged from long-term nursing facilities have resources to prevent homelessness. Patients from ERs or inpatient units may be discharged to: the care of friends or family, residential/group homes, assisted living or skilled facilities, and shelters. Hospital staff works closely with community mental health agencies, 211, state and county agencies, and housing agencies to help patients determine an appropriate discharge location. If the patient does not have a safe discharge location, appropriate locations are identified. Hospital staff assists with any required paperwork in making referrals to an appropriate location. Hospital staff is responsible for the appropriate discharge of patients. The CoC is re-organizing and looking at creating a committee to work with this system to prevent people from being discharged into homelessness.

The Utah Department of Human Services participates on the State Homeless coordinating Council's Discharge Planning Sub-Committee, in conjunction with the continuums of care, coordinate resources and develop discharge plans to assure individuals being discharged from mental health facilities are not exiting into homelessness. The Utah Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health (DSAMH) promotes home and community based services and supportive services provided by the local community mental health centers and substance abuse agencies to help decrease risk factors and link patients to services. DSAMH uses a tracking system to document needed services that are received by patients ready for discharge from State Hospital. REDI (Readiness Evaluation and Discharge Implementation) is used to identify preferences and barriers to transition from the Utah State Hospital and prohibit discharge to homelessness. Discharge options include community based treatment programs, residential placements, market rate apartments, boarding homes, and family with wraparound supportive services.

Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. 91.315(e)

The State of Utah HOPWA Program provides housing and case management services to persons with HIV/AIDS. This includes TBRA assistance, STRMU and PHP housing placement.

For entitlement/consortia grantees: Specify the activities that the jurisdiction plans to undertake during the next year to address the housing and supportive services needs identified in accordance with 91.215(e) with respect to persons who are not homeless but have other special needs. Link to one-year goals. (91.220(2))

The State of Utah HOPWA Program provides housing and case management services to persons with HIV/AIDS. This includes TBRA assistance, STRMU and PHP housing placement.

MA-40 Barriers to Affordable Housing – 91.310(d)

Negative Effects of Public Policies on Affordable Housing and Residential Investment

MA-45 Non-Housing Community Development Assets -91.315(f)

Introduction

Economic Development Market Analysis

Business Activity

Business by Sector	Number of Workers	Number of Jobs	Share of Workers %	Share of Jobs %	Jobs less workers %
Agriculture, Mining, Oil & Gas Extraction	10,180	9,750	4	6	2
Arts, Entertainment, Accommodations	33,565	30,144	15	18	3
Construction	17,351	14,090	8	8	0
Education and Health Care Services	33,347	20,826	15	13	-2
Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	13,043	8,591	6	5	-1
Information	5,018	2,450	2	1	-1
Manufacturing	31,850	22,076	14	13	-1
Other Services	7,134	5,184	3	3	0
Professional, Scientific, Management Services	15,939	8,227	7	5	-2
Public Administration	2,587	2,697	1	2	1
Retail Trade	36,006	27,682	16	17	1
Transportation and Warehousing	11,418	8,210	5	5	0
Wholesale Trade	9,820	6,045	4	4	0
Total	227,258	165,972	--	--	--

Table 43- Business Activity

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS (Workers), 2010 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (Jobs)

Labor Force

Total Population in the Civilian Labor Force	329,876
Civilian Employed Population 16 years and over	311,503
Unemployment Rate	5.57
Unemployment Rate for Ages 16-24	15.97
Unemployment Rate for Ages 25-65	3.23

Table 44 - Labor Force

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Occupations by Sector	Number of People
Management, business and financial	71,376
Farming, fisheries and forestry occupations	12,109
Service	29,004
Sales and office	52,348
Construction, extraction, maintenance and repair	40,020
Production, transportation and material moving	21,980

Table 45 – Occupations by Sector

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Travel Time

Travel Time	Number	Percentage
< 30 Minutes	213,864	74%
30-59 Minutes	58,203	20%
60 or More Minutes	17,963	6%
Total	290,030	100%

Table 46 - Travel Time

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Education:

Educational Attainment by Employment Status (Population 16 and Older)

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Less than high school graduate	15,666	1,541	7,990
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	67,007	3,762	22,903
Some college or Associate's degree	94,587	3,838	27,883

Educational Attainment	In Labor Force		Not in Labor Force
	Civilian Employed	Unemployed	
Bachelor's degree or higher	69,528	1,583	14,829

Table 47 - Educational Attainment by Employment Status

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Educational Attainment by Age

	Age				
	18–24 yrs	25–34 yrs	35–44 yrs	45–65 yrs	65+ yrs
Less than 9th grade	677	2,001	2,269	2,791	2,905
9th to 12th grade, no diploma	9,786	6,285	4,267	7,584	7,581
High school graduate, GED, or alternative	25,340	28,862	22,472	42,515	25,497
Some college, no degree	23,784	27,058	22,301	43,832	18,883
Associate's degree	4,949	10,545	8,753	14,655	3,485
Bachelor's degree	2,557	15,886	15,937	28,481	9,743
Graduate or professional degree	133	4,032	6,999	14,888	5,693

Table 48 - Educational Attainment by Age

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Educational Attainment – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Educational Attainment	Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months
Less than high school graduate	0
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	0
Some college or Associate's degree	0
Bachelor's degree	0
Graduate or professional degree	0

Table 49 – Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months

Data Source: 2006-2010 ACS

Based on the Business Activity table above, what are the major employment sectors within the state?

Major business sectors include retail, arts, entertainment and accommodations, education, and manufacturing.

Describe the workforce and infrastructure needs of business in the state.

Major employment sectors include management, business and finance, and sales and office positions. Utah employees for the most part have relatively short commutes. This is especially true in rural areas where the state small cities CDBG Program operated. In HCD the CDBG program is the only one that can fund economic opportunity type projects. They are also the only fund geared towards infrastructure needs. The AOGs determine local needs and economic opportunity projects have historically received only a small portion of CDBG funds. Utah has a very low unemployment rate economic needs has not been determined to be a high priority.

Describe any major changes that may have an economic impact, such as planned public or private sector investments or initiatives that have affected or may affect job and business growth opportunities during the planning period. Describe any needs for workforce development, business support or infrastructure these changes may create.

The Utah Economy is functioning very well. There are no easily foreseeable imminent changes that will have a large impact on the economy of the state during the coming 5 year period.

How do the skills and education of the current workforce correspond to employment opportunities in the state?

The higher the skill level and education of the workforce the more likely they are to have more and better employment opportunities.

Describe current workforce training initiatives supported by the state. Describe how these efforts will support the state's Consolidated Plan.

The State of Utah has a number of training initiatives including efforts by the Department of Workforce Services efforts to train employees and publically advertise job openings.

Describe any other state efforts to support economic growth.

There are many state efforts to support economic growth. To review them please go to jobs.utah.gov

Discussion

MA-50 Needs and Market Analysis Discussion

Are there areas where households with multiple housing problems are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

Are there any areas in the jurisdiction where racial or ethnic minorities or low-income families are concentrated? (include a definition of "concentration")

What are the characteristics of the market in these areas/neighborhoods?

Are there any community assets in these areas/neighborhoods?

Are there other strategic opportunities in any of these areas?

Strategic Plan

SP-05 Overview

Strategic Plan Overview

The Strategic Plan is a five year plan and includes geographic priorities, priority needs, influence of market conditions, anticipated resources, institutional delivery structure, goals, barriers to affordable housing, homelessness strategy, lead based paint hazard strategy, anti-poverty strategy and monitoring sections.

SP-10 Geographic Priorities – 91.315(a)(1)

Geographic Area

Table 50 - Geographic Priority Areas

1	Area Name:	Bear River Association of Governments
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	3/1/2014
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	This is not a neighborhood, it is a region of Utah consisting of Box Elder, Cache, and Rich Counties
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
2	Area Name:	Five County Association of Governments
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	3/1/2014
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	This is not a neighborhood it is a region of Utah consisting of Garfield, Iron, Kane, Washington, and Wayne Counties.

	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
3	Area Name:	Mountainland Association of Governments
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	3/1/2014
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
4	Area Name:	Six County Association of Governments
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	3/1/2014
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	

	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
5	Area Name:	Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	3/1/2014
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
6	Area Name:	Uintah Basin Association of Governments
	Area Type:	Strategy area

	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	3/1/2014
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
7	Area Name:	Wasatch Front Regional Council
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	3/1/2014
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	

	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	
8	Area Name:	State of Utah
	Area Type:	Strategy area
	Other Target Area Description:	
	HUD Approval Date:	3/1/2014
	% of Low/ Mod:	
	Revital Type:	
	Other Revital Description:	
	Identify the neighborhood boundaries for this target area.	
	Include specific housing and commercial characteristics of this target area.	
	How did your consultation and citizen participation process help you to identify this neighborhood as a target area?	
	Identify the needs in this target area.	
	What are the opportunities for improvement in this target area?	
	Are there barriers to improvement in this target area?	

General Allocation Priorities

Describe the basis for allocating investments geographically within the jurisdiction (or within the EMSA for HOPWA)

As a State program, HCD does not allocate funds to specific neighborhoods, or communities. Among the four programs only CDBG allocates funds geographically. CDBG allocates funds to regional associations of governments (AOGs). The AOGs are comprised of various counties which join together to coordinate planning and the administration of funds. Each AOG receives a base of 6 percent of all CDBG funds and the rest is distributed in relation to the population of the region covered by the AOG's program. The CDBG program cannot distribute funds in areas which operate their own CDBG programs. As a result of this rule the State CDBG programs operates exclusively in rural areas.

The HOME program does not have any specific geographic element to its' distribution system, however in its' rating and ranking system additional points are awarded to projects in rural areas. These points are phased out as the population increases, with projects in areas with a population over 100,000 not

receiving any points. The ESG program operates in predominately urban areas as homelessness is a predominately urban issue.

SP-25 Priority Needs – 91.315(a)(2)

Priority Needs

Table 51 – Priority Needs Summary

1	Priority Need Name	Increase Availability of Affordable Housing
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Low Moderate Large Families Families with Children Elderly Public Housing Residents
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	New Affordable Housing
	Description	Increase the availability of affordable Housing through the creation of new affordable housing units
	Basis for Relative Priority	The is the highest priority the state has identified regarding affordable housing needs.
2	Priority Need Name	Improving Public Infrastructure
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities
	Description	Improving Public Infrastructure
	Basis for Relative Priority	Very High
3	Priority Need Name	Rapid Rehousing of Homeless Individuals
	Priority Level	High

	Population	Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Provide Case Management and Services Prioritize Rapid Rehousing
	Description	Rapid Rehousing of Homeless Individuals
	Basis for Relative Priority	This is the main focus of our program
4	Priority Need Name	Rural Housing
	Priority Level	High
	Population	Low Large Families Families with Children Elderly
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	New Affordable Housing
	Description	Development of new affordable housing in Rural Housing. Also rehabilitation of existing affordable housing.
	Basis for Relative Priority	This has been judged to be a high priority for various of the Regional Associations of Governments which held operate the CDBG Program
5	Priority Need Name	Emergency Shelter
	Priority Level	Low

	Population	Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth
	Geographic Areas Affected	State of Utah
	Associated Goals	Prioritize Rapid Rehousing
	Description	Providing emergency shelter for persons who are homeless.
	Basis for Relative Priority	Relative priority is based on funds allocated towards these priorities. Emergency sheltering is a priority for ESG but is secondary to ESG's primary goal of providing for rapid rehousing of homeless individuals and families.
6	Priority Need Name	Economic Development
	Priority Level	Low
	Population	Non-housing Community Development
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	
	Description	Funding of projects related to economic development and the creation of new jobs in Rural Areas.
	Basis for Relative Priority	
7	Priority Need Name	Provide Case Management and Supportive Services
	Priority Level	Low

	Population	Extremely Low Low Rural Chronic Homelessness Individuals Families with Children Mentally Ill Chronic Substance Abuse veterans Persons with HIV/AIDS Victims of Domestic Violence Unaccompanied Youth Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	Provide Case Management and Services Decrease tenure of Homelessness
	Description	Provide Case Management and Supportive Services for Homeless individuals and persons with HIV/AIDS
	Basis for Relative Priority	Relative to other identified needs less money is being allocated towards this need.
8	Priority Need Name	Housing for Persons with HIV/AIDS
	Priority Level	Low
	Population	Persons with HIV/AIDS and their Families
	Geographic Areas Affected	
	Associated Goals	New Affordable Housing Provide Case Management and Services
	Description	Provide rental assistance for persons with HIV/AIDS.
	Basis for Relative Priority	The is a relatively low priority because of the small amount of funding allocated towards this program.

Narrative (Optional)

Relative priority is determined by funds allocated towards the identified priority.

SP-30 Influence of Market Conditions – 91.315(b)

Influence of Market Conditions

Affordable Housing Type	Market Characteristics that will influence the use of funds available for housing type
Tenant Based Rental Assistance (TBRA)	With the exception of the HOPWA program, the State of Utah does not use TBRA as a method of providing affordable housing.
TBRA for Non-Homeless Special Needs	The HOPWA Program uses TBRA to house persons with HIV/AIDS.
New Unit Production	
Rehabilitation	In four of the AOGs which operate using CDBG funds rehabilitation of housing is a accepted use of funds.
Acquisition, including preservation	In four of the AOGs which operate using CDBG funds rehabilitation of housing is a accepted use of funds.

Table 52 – Influence of Market Conditions

SP-35 Anticipated Resources - 91.315(a)(4), 91.320(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	4,472,159	0	0	4,472,159	22,360,795	
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	3,017,887	0	0	3,017,887	15,089,435	

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOPWA	public - federal	Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA	152,594	0	0	152,594	766,095	
ESG	public - federal	Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	1,110,759	0	0	1,110,759	5,553,795	

Table 53 - Anticipated Resources

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

The State HOME Program promotes leveraging through its rating and ranking system. This has proven successful. In the last program year HOME funds were leveraged at \$14.66 to \$1 and over the course of the last 5 year period leveraging averaged over \$11 to \$1. Regarding the CDBG Program, all AOG regions promote leveraging through their rating and ranking systems.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the state that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

There are no publically owned land or property located within the state that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan.

Discussion

SP-40 Institutional Delivery Structure – 91.315(k)

Explain the institutional structure through which the jurisdiction will carry out its consolidated plan including private industry, non-profit organizations, and public institutions.

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
BEAR RIVER ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS	Regional organization	Economic Development Non-homeless special needs Planning Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Region
FIVE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS	Regional organization	Economic Development Non-homeless special needs Planning Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Region
MOUNTAINLAND ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS	Regional organization	Economic Development Non-homeless special needs Planning Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Region

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
SIX COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT	Regional organization	Economic Development Non-homeless special needs Planning Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Region
SOUTHEASTERN UTAH ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	Regional organization	Economic Development Non-homeless special needs Planning Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Region
Wasatch Front Regional Council	Regional organization	Economic Development Non-homeless special needs Planning Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Region
UINTAH BASIN ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS	Regional organization	Economic Development Non-homeless special needs Planning Rental neighborhood improvements public facilities public services	Region

Responsible Entity	Responsible Entity Type	Role	Geographic Area Served
WASATCH HOMELESS HEALTH CARE - 4TH STREET CLINIC	Philanthropic organization	Homelessness	Jurisdiction
Salt Lake Community Action Program	Philanthropic organization	Homelessness	Jurisdiction
HOUSING AUTHORITY OF SALT LAKE COUNTY	PHA	Homelessness	Jurisdiction

Table 54 - Institutional Delivery Structure

Assess of Strengths and Gaps in the Institutional Delivery System

Availability of services targeted to homeless persons and persons with HIV and mainstream services

Homelessness Prevention Services	Available in the Community	Targeted to Homeless	Targeted to People with HIV
Homelessness Prevention Services			
Counseling/Advocacy	X	X	X
Legal Assistance	X	X	X
Mortgage Assistance	X		
Rental Assistance	X	X	X
Utilities Assistance	X	X	X
Street Outreach Services			
Law Enforcement	X	X	X
Mobile Clinics	X	X	X
Other Street Outreach Services	X	X	X
Supportive Services			
Alcohol & Drug Abuse	X	X	X
Child Care	X		
Education	X	X	X
Employment and Employment Training	X	X	X
Healthcare	X	X	X
HIV/AIDS	X	X	X
Life Skills	X	X	X
Mental Health Counseling	X	X	X
Transportation	X		
Other			
Homeless Court	X	X	X

Table 55 - Homeless Prevention Services Summary

Describe the extent to which services targeted to homeless person and persons with HIV and mainstream services, such as health, mental health and employment services are made available to and used by homeless persons (particularly chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families and unaccompanied youth) and persons with HIV within the jurisdiction

The services available for the homeless are available to persons with HIV/AIDS.

Describe the strengths and gaps of the service delivery system for special needs population and persons experiencing homelessness, including, but not limited to, the services listed above

The only services not currently provided are services for child care and transportation. This is a very strong service delivery system and although not all services are available and gaps do exist, the majority of services are being extended.

Provide a summary of the strategy for overcoming gaps in the institutional structure and service delivery system for carrying out a strategy to address priority needs

Right now there are no plans to expand services to include child care and transportation.

SP-45 Goals Summary – 91.315(a)(4)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	New Affordable Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs		Increase Availability of Affordable Housing Rural Housing Housing for Persons with HIV/AIDS	HOPWA: \$141,912 HOME: \$5,000,000	Rental units constructed: 2000 Household Housing Unit Rental units rehabilitated: 200 Household Housing Unit Housing for People with HIV/AIDS added: 4 Household Housing Unit HIV/AIDS Housing Operations: 60 Household Housing Unit
2	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities	2015	2019	Non-Housing Community Development		Improving Public Infrastructure	CDBG: \$3,000,000	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit: 500 Persons Assisted
3	Provide Case Management and Services	2015	2019	Homeless Non-Homeless Special Needs		Rapid Rehousing of Homeless Individuals Housing for Persons with HIV/AIDS Provide Case Management and Supportive Services	HOPWA: \$10,682 ESG: \$2,000,000	Other: 192 Other

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
4	Prioritize Rapid Rehousing	2015	2019	Homeless	State of Utah	Rapid Rehousing of Homeless Individuals Emergency Shelter	ESG: \$3,943,025	Tenant-based rental assistance / Rapid Rehousing: 1750 Households Assisted Homeless Person Overnight Shelter: 35750 Persons Assisted
5	Decrease tenure of Homelessness	2015	2019	Homeless	State of Utah	Provide Case Management and Supportive Services	ESG: \$2,123,170	Other: 30 Other

Table 56 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	New Affordable Housing
	Goal Description	This goal is a five year goal regarding the creation of new affordable rental units and the rehabilitation of existing affordable multifamily housing unit.
2	Goal Name	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities
	Goal Description	Public Facility or Infrastructure Activities other than Low/Moderate Income Housing Benefit.
3	Goal Name	Provide Case Management and Services
	Goal Description	Hours of case management and other supportive services for homeless and also for persons with HIV/AIDS

4	Goal Name	Prioritize Rapid Rehousing
	Goal Description	Prioritization for funding will be given to rapid rehousing case management and direct payments on a person's behalf. As such, emergency sheltering will not be as greatly funded.
5	Goal Name	Decrease tenure of Homelessness
	Goal Description	Decrease the tenure of persons who become homeless. This is measured as a percent decrease in the amount of time a person is homeless.

Estimate the number of extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families to whom the jurisdiction will provide affordable housing as defined by HOME 91.315(b)(2)

The number of persons for whom affordable housing is provided is estimated to be approximately 4000 persons for the HOME Program, 200 persons for the CDBG program, 36000 persons assisted in the ESG program, and 200 persons with the HOPWA program. In total this makes for 40200 persons over the course of the 5 year Consolidated Planning period.

SP-50 Public Housing Accessibility and Involvement – 91.315(c)

Need to Increase the Number of Accessible Units (if Required by a Section 504 Voluntary Compliance Agreement)

N/A

Activities to Increase Resident Involvements

N/A

Is the public housing agency designated as troubled under 24 CFR part 902?

N/A

Plan to remove the ‘troubled’ designation

N/A

SP-55 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.315(h)

Barriers to Affordable Housing

Strategy to Remove or Ameliorate the Barriers to Affordable Housing

SP-60 Homelessness Strategy – 91.315(d)

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

Addressing the emergency and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again.

Help low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families who are likely to become homeless after being discharged from a publicly funded institution or system of care, or who are receiving assistance from public and private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education or youth needs

SP-65 Lead based paint Hazards – 91.315(i)

Actions to address LBP hazards and increase access to housing without LBP hazards

The State of Utah has estimated that there are 75,000 homes in the non-entitlement areas that were constructed prior to 1978. Of these homes, an estimated 20,000 are most likely to have lead-based paint somewhere in the home. And it is expected that 12,000 of these homes are occupied by low or moderate-income persons. As a State, Utah has one of the lowest rates in the country for lead poisoning for children under the age of 6 years – only 1%.

Housing rehabilitation programs are carried out by 5 of the 7 regional Associations of Government organizations. However, lead-based paint reduction is not the primary focus of these housing rehab programs. As lead-based paint is encountered in homes targeted for rehab with HUD dollars, it is mitigated by following HUD's lead-based paint regulations. All pre-1978 multifamily and single family units that are funded with HUD dollars are required to meet all HUD requirements for testing and mitigation of lead-based paint. In addition, EPA's new Lead Renovation, Repair and Painting (RRP) rule took effect April 22, 2010. All contractors performing activities that disturb more than six square feet of surface area in homes, child care facilities, schools or other public and commercial facilities built before 1978 must be certified and must follow specific work practices to prevent lead contamination. Utah is making concerted efforts to insure that contractors have completed the new training.

Housing replacement has become more common in the rural areas where rehabilitation of older manufactured homes is not cost effective. This practice will further reduce the number of pre-1978 homes in the State. The challenge for the program managers continues to be 1) limited funding 2) local staff turnover 3) lack of trained contractors in the rural areas and 4) a large geographic area (80,000 square miles) to cover.

The urban areas of Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County operate very successful lead hazard reduction/housing rehab programs. This is due in part to the relatively small urban geographic they serve. Federal budget cuts will limit the number of homes that can be served.

We encourage partnerships between the Weatherization, CDBG and HOME programs so that trained staff is available in each of the 7 regions to test the pre-1978 homes of low income persons. However, the proposed massive budget cuts to the CDBG program threaten to eliminate our housing rehab programs. However, we will continue to strive to raise the awareness of the issue of lead-based paint and lead poisoning in the State of Utah.

How are the actions listed above integrated into housing policies and procedures?

SP-70 Anti-Poverty Strategy – 91.315(j)

Jurisdiction Goals, Programs and Policies for reducing the number of Poverty-Level Families

How are the Jurisdiction poverty reducing goals, programs, and policies coordinated with this affordable housing plan

SP-80 Monitoring – 91.330

Describe the standards and procedures that the state will use to monitor activities carried out in furtherance of the plan and will use to ensure long-term compliance with requirements of the programs involved, including minority business outreach and the comprehensive planning requirements

Expected Resources

AP-15 Expected Resources – 91.320(c)(1,2)

Introduction

Anticipated Resources

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
CDBG	public - federal	Acquisition Admin and Planning Economic Development Housing Public Improvements Public Services	4,472,159	0	0	4,472,159	22,360,795	

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
HOME	public - federal	Acquisition Homebuyer assistance Homeowner rehab Multifamily rental new construction Multifamily rental rehab New construction for ownership TBRA	3,017,887	0	0	3,017,887	15,089,435	
HOPWA	public - federal	Permanent housing in facilities Permanent housing placement Short term or transitional housing facilities STRMU Supportive services TBRA	152,594	0	0	152,594	766,095	

Program	Source of Funds	Uses of Funds	Expected Amount Available Year 1				Expected Amount Available Reminder of ConPlan \$	Narrative Description
			Annual Allocation: \$	Program Income: \$	Prior Year Resources: \$	Total: \$		
ESG	public - federal	Conversion and rehab for transitional housing Financial Assistance Overnight shelter Rapid re-housing (rental assistance) Rental Assistance Services Transitional housing	1,110,759	0	0	1,110,759	5,553,795	

Table 57 - Expected Resources – Priority Table

Explain how federal funds will leverage those additional resources (private, state and local funds), including a description of how matching requirements will be satisfied

The State HOME Program promotes leveraging through its rating and ranking system. This has proven successful. In the last program year HOME funds were leveraged at \$14.66 to \$1 and over the course of the last 5 year period leveraging averaged over \$11 to \$1. Regarding the CDBG Program, all AOG regions promote leveraging through their rating and ranking systems.

If appropriate, describe publically owned land or property located within the jurisdiction that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan

There are no publically owned land or property located within the state that may be used to address the needs identified in the plan.

Discussion

Annual Goals and Objectives

AP-20 Annual Goals and Objectives – 91.320(c)(3)&(e)

Goals Summary Information

Sort Order	Goal Name	Start Year	End Year	Category	Geographic Area	Needs Addressed	Funding	Goal Outcome Indicator
1	New Affordable Housing	2015	2019	Affordable Housing Non-Homeless Special Needs	State of Utah	Increase Availability of Affordable Housing	HOPWA: \$100,000 HOME: \$5,000,000	Rental units constructed: 650 Household Housing Unit Rental units rehabilitated: 150 Household Housing Unit

Table 58 – Goals Summary

Goal Descriptions

1	Goal Name	New Affordable Housing
	Goal Description	The creation of new affordable housing through the development of new rental properties.

AP-25 Allocation Priorities – 91.320(d)

Introduction:

Funding Allocation Priorities

Program	Goals		
CDBG			
HOME			
HOPWA			
ESG			

Table 59 – Funding Allocation Priorities

Reason for Allocation Priorities

How will the proposed distribution of funds will address the priority needs and specific objectives described in the Consolidated Plan?

AP-30 Methods of Distribution – 91.320(d)&(k)

Introduction:

Distribution Methods

Table 60 - Distribution Methods by State Program

Discussion:

The HUD funds for HOME, CDBG, ESG, and HOPWA are governed by each program's allocation plan.

Those plans are created in a public process that provides at least an annual hearing. Hearings are advertised statewide in accordance with Utah's Open Public Meeting law. Comments are considered in finalizing changes and updates to each allocation plan. In addition, each program's distribution of funds is governed by state Boards with membership appointed by the Governor and other advisory committees which make final decisions for project funding in an open public meeting format. A representative of the Attorney General's Office also provides consultation to HCD staff and the related Boards on open public meeting laws and processes.

AP-35 Projects – (Optional)

Introduction:

HCD does not have a list of projects which will be funded in the coming program year. Program priorities and needs have been identified, but specific projects to be funded are always subject to change up until the actual applications are received and the various program boards deliberate on their value and worth.

#	Project Name

Table 61 – Project Information

Describe the reasons for allocation priorities and any obstacles to addressing underserved needs

HOME has prioritized the creation of new affordable housing. CDBG has prioritized public infrastructure and other community needs in rural areas. ESG has prioritized the rapid rehousing of homeless and the elimination of chronic homelessness. HOPWA is dedicated to providing affordable housing for persons with HIV/AIDS.

These priorities are the same priorities identified in the five year consolidated plan. These priorities were identified by HCD after careful consultation with local leaders, public representatives, and a thorough analysis of housing, demographic, and economic information provided by the Census and other legitimate data sources. HCD has found that increasing the number of affordable housing and the rapid rehousing of homeless to be the most effective means of providing stable housing to underprivileged Utahans. CDBG's partnership with regional AOGs has allowed extensive consultation with local leaders to take place and has proven effective in ensuring that the greatest needs in rural Utah are the needs being addressed by the CDBG program.

Obstacles to addressing underserved needs are found in poor census information, discouraging regulations attached to federal funds, and a lack of advocacy in rural areas.

Poor census information is an impediment to the carrying out of HCD programs. Rural areas in particular suffer from extreme unreliability. This is due to the elimination of the long form of the census and the increased use of the American Community Survey. The survey, while effective in highly populated regions, does not accurately reflect the demographic, housing, and economic situation of rural areas. This discourages a good understanding of the housing market and the individual needs which exist in Rural Utah. Poor information regarding disability, the existence of dilapidated housing, the number of minorities, homelessness, and single parent or large households have all been barriers to addressing underserved needs.

Regulations attached to federal funds has been another obstacle. This has been especially true for the

CDBG program which operated in Rural Utah. Applicants from rural areas often do not have the time or manpower to deal with the various regulations imposed by HUD. Extensive and sometimes expensive civil rights compliance are often discouraging for small town part-time officials.

The last obstacle to addressing underserved needs is a lack of effective advocacy in rural areas. While highly populated areas are well served by non-profit advocacy groups who highlight and champion the cause of a variety of needy underserved populations, these groups do not exist in many rural regions of the state.

HCD, the CDBG program, and regional AOGs, are all working diligently to overcome these barriers and work with rural communities to ensure the underserved needs are properly identified and that any obstacles to program utilization are worked out.

AP-38 Project Summary
Project Summary Information

AP-40 Section 108 Loan Guarantee – 91.320(k)(1)(ii)

Will the state help non-entitlement units of general local government to apply for Section 108 loan funds?

No

Available Grant Amounts

N/A

Acceptance process of applications

N/A

AP-45 Community Revitalization Strategies – 91.320(k)(1)(ii)

Will the state allow units of general local government to carry out community revitalization strategies?

No

State's Process and Criteria for approving local government revitalization strategies

N/A

AP-50 Geographic Distribution – 91.320(f)

Description of the geographic areas of the state (including areas of low-income and minority concentration) where assistance will be directed

As a State program, HCD does not allocate funds to specific neighborhoods, or communities. Among the four programs only CDBG allocates funds geographically, they do so by allocating funds to regional associations of governments (AOGs). The AOGs are all comprised of various counties which join together to coordinate planning and the administration of funds. The allocation of CDBG funds is determined by giving each AOG a base amount of funds with the remainder being divided based on population.

Geographic Distribution

Target Area	Percentage of Funds
Five County Association of Governments	6
Mountainland Association of Governments	7
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments	10
Wasatch Front Regional Council	7
Six County Association of Governments	6
Bear River Association of Governments	6
Uintah Basin Association of Governments	6
State of Utah	52

Table 62 - Geographic Distribution

Rationale for the priorities for allocating investments geographically

HOME, HOPWA and ESG funds are not distributed geographically. CDBG funds are distributed to the seven regional associations of government. The percentage of funds which they receive in relation to the total funds the four State programs receive is listed above in table 10. As stated earlier in the “Method of Distribution” section of this document those funds are allocated on a per capita basis.

Discussion

Affordable Housing

AP-55 Affordable Housing – 24 CFR 91.320(g)

Introduction:

HCD has made great progress towards providing affordable housing. The creation of new affordable units is the primary focus of the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund, and is also supported by the other programs at HCD. Rental assistance is common in helping both the homeless and HIV/AIDS populations. Rehab of existing units is also supported by HCD funds.

One Year Goals for the Number of Households to be Supported	
Homeless	300
Non-Homeless	1,145
Special-Needs	0
Total	1,445

Table 63 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Requirement

One Year Goals for the Number of Households Supported Through	
Rental Assistance	359
The Production of New Units	642
Rehab of Existing Units	367
Acquisition of Existing Units	77
Total	1,445

Table 64 - One Year Goals for Affordable Housing by Support Type

Discussion:

HCD has chosen to focus on the creation of affordable housing and on ending chronic homelessness. HCD does promote the special needs population in its rating and ranking of funding applications; however, HCD does not set aside funds specifically for projects which are dedicated towards special needs households. Special needs groups such as veterans, youth aging out of foster care, single mothers, victims of domestic violence, the elderly, and disable households all add value to the application process. The reason this is not reflected in HCD's goals is that funds are designated for affordability, and not set-aside or earmarked for any of these special needs populations.

AP-60 Public Housing - 24 CFR 91.320(j)

Introduction:

The State of Utah does not directly fund PHA's.

Actions planned during the next year to address the needs to public housing

N/A

Actions to encourage public housing residents to become more involved in management and participate in homeownership

N/A

If the PHA is designated as troubled, describe the manner in which financial assistance will be provided or other assistance

N/A

Discussion:

N/A

AP-65 Homeless and Other Special Needs Activities – 91.320(h)

Introduction

Describe the jurisdictions one-year goals and actions for reducing and ending homelessness including

Reaching out to homeless persons (especially unsheltered persons) and assessing their individual needs

The State of Utah's ESG funding has been specifically designated to assisting the literally homeless. As such, all of this funding has been designated to street outreach to identify unsheltered individuals, rapid rehousing, rapid rehousing staff, emergency shelter, and emergency shelter staffing. Street outreach comprises roughly 28% of the total FY15 budget and staffing for emergency shelters and rapid rehousing staff account for another 14%. This investment in staffing is aimed at reaching out to homeless persons and using the coordinated assessment tools designated by the agency's CoC in an effort to align them with the services they need.

Addressing the emergency shelter and transitional housing needs of homeless persons

The State of Utah's ESG funding will continue to be allocated to emergency shelters throughout the state. We also require the emergency shelters to record the numbers served and outcomes when exiting shelter in HMIS. HCD encourages best practices be used in temporary sheltering or when housing individuals and families. HCD has awarded emergency shelters with rapid rehousing dollars as well in order to facilitate a timely and appropriate exit from shelter and accomplish HCD's goal to reduce the length of stay in shelter.

Helping homeless persons (especially chronically homeless individuals and families, families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth) make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, including shortening the period of time that individuals and families experience homelessness, facilitating access for homeless individuals and families to affordable housing units, and preventing individuals and families who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again

HCD is following the ESG requirement that all recipients must participate in their CoC's adopted coordinated entry system. As ESG recipients use their coordinated entry/assessment to make housing decisions this should allocate resources to those in most need, provide the appropriate level of intervention, and decrease the amount of time a household will experience homelessness. Additionally, State of Utah ESG rapid rehousing funds are awarded to emergency shelters in an effort to facilitate moving chronically homeless individuals and families, veteran individuals and families and homeless youths into permanent housing.

Helping low-income individuals and families avoid becoming homeless, especially extremely low-income individuals and families and those who are: being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care (such as health care facilities, mental health facilities, foster care and other youth facilities, and corrections programs and institutions); or, receiving assistance from public or private agencies that address housing, health, social services, employment, education, or youth needs

In many of the communities state-wide there are several systems in place aimed towards homeless prevention. Community Action Programs and other non-profits provide wrap around services to address poverty and HCD is committed to supporting these efforts. TANF, HOPWA and CSBG grants are distributed state-wide to provide financial assistance to those who are extremely low-income and require short-term assistance in order to stabilize their housing.

The Utah Department of Human Services' (DHS) Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) Practice Guidelines require a transition plan be developed at least 90 days prior to discharge with youth exiting foster care at age 18 and prohibits discharge to homelessness. Transition discharge plan to include: support services; housing; health care/insurance; vocational/educational needs; employment/workforce support. Persons exiting foster care are routinely discharged to family members, foster parents, independent living situations such as apartments, student housing, and other supervised living conditions. They may also be discharged to group homes or community residences that include supports and supervision. HCD also supports the Homeless Youth Resource Center (HYRC) run through Volunteers of America. The HYRC provides case management, street outreach, and a drop-in center for at risk youth and homeless youth.

Utah Department of Corrections in conjunction with the Utah Board of Pardons and Parole commit to not release state inmates on parole to a homeless shelter or into a homeless situation. Paroling inmates must have a residence that has been verified by AP&P agents prior to release or be assigned to a UDC Community Corrections Center for housing. Efforts are made to ensure that the residence is suitable housing. Additionally, services are provided to inmates to reduce recidivism and housing stability including: education, substance abuse treatment, vocational training/certification, employment (job readiness and resume courses) and transitional cognitive courses. Discharge options include residential treatment, boarding homes, halfway houses, market rate apartments, and family /friends. There have been several programs implemented to provide additional layers of support as well. Women's Assistance and Reentry Mentoring (WARM) is a housing and mentoring program targeting women being released from prison run through the Housing Authority of the County of Salt Lake (HACSL), Re-Entry Assistance Program (REAP) assists those exiting jail run through Golden Spike Outreach, and Your Parole Requires Extensive Preparation (YPREP) is aimed towards furthering inmate education run through the Utah Department of Corrections are a few examples of programs that assist those transitioning from incarceration.

For a description of the programs that ensure that persons returning from mental and physical health

institutions receive appropriate supportive housing see MA-35.

HCD will continue to support the efforts made by partnering agencies and provide assistance when applicable. The DWS supportive services committee continues to refine protocol to support employment for those leaving incarceration, juvenile justice, and foster care.

Set-aside housing units will be targeted during 2015-16 when DHDC conducts on-going compliance monitoring. HCD will ensure that housing units originally targeted to support discharged populations continue to target those populations. HCD will ensure that service providers are tapped into the State of Utah's affordable housing database of property and unit listings.

Discussion

AP-70 HOPWA Goals – 91.320(k)(4)

One year goals for the number of households to be provided housing through the use of HOPWA for:	
Short-term rent, mortgage, and utility assistance to prevent homelessness of the individual or family	30
Tenant-based rental assistance	22
Units provided in permanent housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	8
Units provided in transitional short-term housing facilities developed, leased, or operated with HOPWA funds	4
Total	64

AP-75 Barriers to affordable housing – 91.320(i)

Introduction:

Affordability is an issue which HCD takes very seriously. A large majority of HCDs funds go towards promoting affordable housing in the form of the creation of new affordable units and other methods or housing assistance. HCD works with cities to eliminate barriers to fair housing. State law requires communities to compete affordable housing plans. HCD has taken the initiative in promoting the completion of quality plans. A new affordable housing plan database and template has been created by staff, and trainings and outreach has been effective in improving the quality of plans.

Actions it planned to remove or ameliorate the negative effects of public policies that serve as barriers to affordable housing such as land use controls, tax policies affecting land, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment

In reviewing affordable housing plans which have been submitted by communities throughout the state, HCD staff has noticed improvements in the quality of the submitted plans. A template has been created with an associated scoring rubric. Scores for submitted plans have improved. This shows a renewed commitment by communities to promote affordability.

The main method through which the Housing and Community Development Division attempts to ameliorate the negative effects of public policies, that serve as barriers to affordable housing, is through the promotion of good and effective local municipal Moderate Income Housing Plans.

Utah State Law requires municipalities to write affordable housing plans which are meant to be updated every two years. HCD staff receive these plans and evaluate them. Staff provide technical training and guidance to municipalities regarding the appropriate analyses and evaluations which they are meant to undertake. Staff have recently created a sophisticated rubric and scoring mechanism for evaluating these plans and are actively giving feedback to municipalities as to how to improve their plans. Furthermore, staff have created an advanced online template which allows communities to gather pertinent data, in both text, and graphic format. This template is very easy to use and is currently in use by communities throughout the state. Trainings on this new technology are being held to educate municipalities on how to improve their affordable housing plans. These trainings are being held statewide, including at the annual Utah American Planning Association.

The affordable housing plans are supposed to evaluation land use controls, tax policies, zoning ordinances, building codes, fees and charges, growth limitations, and policies affecting the return on residential investment.

Additionally, both the HOME and CDBG programs awards points, in their rating and ranking systems, to applicants whose communities have written a highly rated affordable housing plan. Also, one of HCD's programs, the Community Driven Housing Program is only made available to communities which have written highly rated affordable housing plans. This encourages communities to evaluate their community needs as well as any policies which may discourage affordable housing.

Discussion:

AP-85 Other Actions – 91.320(j)

Introduction:

Actions planned to address obstacles to meeting underserved needs

Actions planned to foster and maintain affordable housing

The HOME, ESG, and HOPWA programs are all focused on different segments of the housing market. These programs employ their own unique methods to fostering and maintaining affordable housing. The HOME program is dedicated to the creation of new affordable housing. Each year the HOME program is responsible for the creation of 60-750 new affordable housing units. The HOME program works with all the properties it funds to ensure that the properties are operated successfully. HOME staff study all properties to determine that they are economically viable. HOME also inspects all properties it funds to ensure that affordable housing is maintained in good condition and that all residents have submitted appropriate paperwork and are correctly placed within their units. Units approved by HOME target (and are affordable to) individuals which on average earn 40 percent of the area median income.

The ESG program is responsible for the creation of new homeless units and the efficient use of existing homeless facilities. Homeless facilities are extremely affordable in that the residents for the most part are not expected to pay for their accommodations. These facilities are also monitored and closed maintained

The HOPWA program assists the placement of persons with HIV/AIDS into affordable housing units.

The CDBG program is focused on both community needs than and housing. However, every year CDBG funds support rental assistance, and down payment assistance in rural areas of Utah.

These efforts are ongoing and each year HCD works to foster and maintain affordable housing.

Actions planned to reduce lead-based paint hazards

The State of Utah has estimated that there are 75,000 homes in the non-entitlement areas that were constructed prior to 1978. Of these homes, an estimated 20,000 are most likely to have lead-based paint somewhere in the home. And it is expected that 12,000 of these homes are occupied by low or moderate-income persons. As a State, Utah has one of the lowest rates in the country for lead poisoning for children under the age of 6 years – only 1%.

Housing rehabilitation programs are carried out by 5 of the 7 regional Associations of Government organizations. However, lead-based paint reduction is not the primary focus of these housing rehab

programs. As lead-based paint is encountered in homes targeted for rehab with HUD dollars, it is mitigated by following HUD's lead-based paint regulations. All pre-1978 multifamily and single family units that are funded with HUD dollars are required to meet all HUD requirements for testing and mitigation of lead-based paint. In addition, EPA's new Lead Renovation, Repair and Painting (RRP) rule took effect April 22, 2010. All contractors performing activities that disturb more than six square feet of surface area in homes, child care facilities, schools or other public and commercial facilities built before 1978 must be certified and must follow specific work practices to prevent lead contamination. Utah is making concerted efforts to insure that contractors have completed the new training.

Housing replacement has become more common in the rural areas where rehabilitation of older manufactured homes is not cost effective. This practice will further reduce the number of pre-1978 homes in the State. The challenge for the program managers continues to be 1) limited funding 2) local staff turnover 3) lack of trained contractors in the rural areas and 4) a large geographic area (80,000 square miles) to cover.

The urban areas of Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County operate very successful lead hazard reduction/housing rehab programs. This is due in part to the relatively small urban geographic they serve. Federal budget cuts will limit the number of homes that can be served.

We encourage partnerships between the Weatherization, CDBG and HOME programs so that trained staff is available in each of the 7 regions to test the pre-1978 homes of low income persons. However, the proposed massive budget cuts to the CDBG program threaten to eliminate our housing rehab programs. However, we will continue to strive to raise the awareness of the issue of lead-based paint and lead poisoning in the State of Utah.

Actions planned to reduce the number of poverty-level families

By promoting affordable housing and the rapid rehousing of homeless households, HCD promotes stability and a footing for families to build the stability to earn enough to no longer be impoverished. Also case management and counseling is provided to assist households in this transition.

Actions planned to develop institutional structure

HCD has identified a gap in institutional structure in regards to the financing of affordable housing. Funds which are raised through the requirements of the Community Reinvestment Act have not been invested in affordable housing due to the lack of an adequate organization to coordinate the expenditure of these funds. In April 2014 the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund approved the expenditure of funds towards the creation of a Transit Oriented Development Fund. Our contribution to this fund will be leveraged with CRA funds and fill the gap in financing which previously existed.

Actions planned to enhance coordination between public and private housing and social service agencies

The State ESG Program is a partner on the Utah State Homelessness Coordinating Committee. The State Homeless Coordinating Committee is committed to coordinating the efforts of public private and social service agencies in addressing homelessness. HCD's efforts have been a valuable contribution towards achieving the goal of overcoming chronic homelessness. However, equally important this Committee has pioneered efforts in Utah in showing the value and feasibility of coordination between public private and social service agencies. The Olene Walker housing loan fund also reaches out to both public private and social service agencies in its efforts. HCD works with cities, non-profits, and private developers and contractors in the course of completing its work. The State Small Cities CDBG Program has taken the innovative approach of allowing its program to be run through regional Associations of Governments. These AOGs have strong connections to the local social service agencies and the local jurisdictions and private enterprises in their respective regions. Having the CDBG program broken up and run by the AOGs improves the ability of the program to coordinate with local providers and react to the needs of local communities.

Discussion:

Program Specific Requirements

AP-90 Program Specific Requirements – 91.320(k)(1,2,3)

Introduction:

Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)

Reference 24 CFR 91.320(k)(1)

Projects planned with all CDBG funds expected to be available during the year are identified in the Projects Table. The following identifies program income that is available for use that is included in projects to be carried out.

1. The total amount of program income that will have been received before the start of the next program year and that has not yet been reprogrammed	0
2. The amount of proceeds from section 108 loan guarantees that will be used during the year to address the priority needs and specific objectives identified in the grantee's strategic plan.	0
3. The amount of surplus funds from urban renewal settlements	0
4. The amount of any grant funds returned to the line of credit for which the planned use has not been included in a prior statement or plan	0
5. The amount of income from float-funded activities	0
Total Program Income:	0

Other CDBG Requirements

1. The amount of urgent need activities	0
2. The estimated percentage of CDBG funds that will be used for activities that benefit persons of low and moderate income. Overall Benefit - A consecutive period of one, two or three years may be used to determine that a minimum overall benefit of 70% of CDBG funds is used to benefit persons of low and moderate income. Specify the years covered that include this Annual Action Plan.	84.11%

HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME)

Reference 24 CFR 91.320(k)(2)

1. A description of other forms of investment being used beyond those identified in Section 92.205 is as follows:

OWHLF does not engage in other forms of investment beyond those identified in Section 92.205

2. A description of the guidelines that will be used for resale or recapture of HOME funds when used for homebuyer activities as required in 92.254, is as follows:

Contracts issued by the Division of Housing and Community Development for projects funded by the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund Board (using HOME funds and state match including program income) include language that requires adherence to recapture provisions per CFR 92.254 (a) (5). The promissory note for loans also restates the recapture requirement and the affordability period. Under the recapture option selected by HCD, the division will recover all of the HOME assistance or share in net proceeds at the time of the sale by the borrower/grantee. Depending upon each particular project, HCD will apply one of the basic options for recapture:

1. HCD can recapture the balance remaining on the entire amount of the HOME assistance from the borrower/grantee if the property is sold during the HUD affordability period,
2. HCD can elect to reduce the amount of the HOME assistance to be repaid on a pro-rata basis according to the amount of the affordability period the borrower/grantee has owned and occupied the property,
3. HCD and the borrower/grantee can share the net proceeds of the sale of the property based upon the ratio of the HOME assistance provided to the sum of the borrowers/grantee's investment plus the HOME assistance, or
4. HCD may allow the borrower/grantee to recover his/her entire investment before any of the HOME assistance is repaid to the HCD from the remaining net proceeds of the sale of the property.

In most cases, HCD will apply option #1 above. There are no restrictions on the price of the property or an income requirement of the buyer. Upon recapture, the affordability period is terminated. HCD will identify the returned funds as program income and use the returned funds for other HOME-eligible activities.

In cases of foreclosure, HCD will recapture the amount from net proceeds available from the sale rather than the entire amount of the HOME investment. If there are no net proceeds from the foreclosure, repayment to the HOME account is not required and HOME affordability requirements are considered satisfied.

3. A description of the guidelines for resale or recapture that ensures the affordability of units acquired with HOME funds? See 24 CFR 92.254(a)(4) are as follows:

Only rarely does HCD apply resale provisions. Resale option is typically used in areas where it is difficult to obtain affordable housing such as areas with high home prices, rapidly appreciating housing costs, shortage of affordable homes and no land available. In this case, the property must remain affordable for the length of the HUD designated affordability period. If the original

borrower/grantee sells the property, it must be sold to a buyer with an AMI between 65%-80%. Depending upon each particular project, HCD will ensure that the resale price must provide the original borrower with a "fair return on investment" which includes any initial investment by the borrower as well as any capital investment. The fair return will be based off of the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index over the period of ownership. In a declining market, a loss of investment may constitute a "fair return on investment". Capital investments must increase the value of the home, prolong the life of the home, adapt it to new uses and last longer than one year. Capital improvements may include, but are not limited to the following: new roof, additions to the home, kitchen or bathroom modernization, landscaping, fence.

4. Plans for using HOME funds to refinance existing debt secured by multifamily housing that is rehabilitated with HOME funds along with a description of the refinancing guidelines required that will be used under 24 CFR 92.206(b), are as follows:

The state does not use federal funds to refinance multi-family housing projects.

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Reference 91.320(k)(3)

1. Include written standards for providing ESG assistance (may include as attachment)
2. If the Continuum of Care has established centralized or coordinated assessment system that meets HUD requirements, describe that centralized or coordinated assessment system.

Below are statements made by each of the three CoC's in their most recent CoC Application regarding their centralized or coordinated assessments:

Balance of State:

The State's three CoCs have contracted for a quick assessment system to be built within HMIS. This quick assessment was vetted through the LHCCs by way of the coordinated assessment workgroup. The BoS CoC is also currently experimenting with the VI-SPDAT as an initial assessment tool, which will be used in conjunction with the point in time count as a way of identifying vulnerable and chronically homeless persons that will be placed on a community-based housing wait list. Specialized service groups are being consulted for ideas to address prioritization for homeless prevention services and participation from agencies that provide services to victims of domestic violence. Each CoC is to develop a specific policy on how its particular system will address the needs of individuals and families who are fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault or stalking, but who are seeking shelter or services from non-victim service providers.

Mountainland:

The Mountainland CoC operates the coordinated intake and assessment system through 2-1-1 in partnership with the housing and homeless service providers. A client may present for services at any CoC service provider or contact the coordinated intake and assessment system through United Way 2-1-1. Following the initial standardized assessment (including a quick assessment for emergency services), the system is consulted to give clear direction for accessing appropriate services. Persons are then tracked as they progress toward housing and/or support services. Prioritization is given to certain populations, such as vulnerable chronic homeless persons, DV survivors where housing is an element of their overall safety, and homeless families with children where family unity is essential.

Salt Lake and Tooele:

Salt Lake and Tooele COC has developed a collaborative, written Coordinated Access Plan. Consensus exists for a COC wide, multi-access entry point quick assessment method for any homeless individual or family in need of emergency shelter or service. Our 211 system, service providers, government agencies, etc. publicize all existing access points. Anyone in need has clear direction for accessing appropriate services. After entry into an appropriate emergency service, individuals are tracked as they progress toward housing and/or support interventions. A community wide housing prioritization and placement process has been in place for two years. All homeless families and those individuals prioritized for PSH placements are guided toward this centralized process and placed into one of several housing programs depending on assessment. Standardized assessments include a quick assessment for emergency services and eligibility and enrollment materials for housing placements.

3. Identify the process for making sub-awards and describe how the ESG allocation available to private nonprofit organizations (including community and faith-based organizations).

The state of Utah does not offer sub-awards.

State ESG funds are allocated through the State's Unified Funding process, which includes allocation recommendations from the State Homeless Coordinating Committee's Allocation Committee and approval by the State Homeless Coordinating Committee (SHCC). The SHCC is chaired by the Lt. Governor and is representative of homeless stakeholders state-wide including the CoC president or leader from each of the three CoC's. Priorities for funding are presented first to the SHCC's Allocation Committee. Once approved, the priorities are presented to the SHCC for approval. The State Community Services office then issues a press release publicizing the request for proposal and a state-wide training. Any interested parties are invited to attend this training and apply for funding, including nonprofit organizations, community and faith-based organizations. The training covers

specific guidance for and presentation of funding priorities and any changes in application process. The conclusion of the training also marks the day the online application will be open. After an appropriate amount of time, the application is closed and SCSO staff begins reviewing the applications and score them based on past performance and strength of application. The SHCC Allocation Committee then schedules hearings if further information is required. A list of recommendations is finally taken to the SHCC for final approval.

4. If the jurisdiction is unable to meet the homeless participation requirement in 24 CFR 576.405(a), the jurisdiction must specify its plan for reaching out to and consulting with homeless or formerly homeless individuals in considering policies and funding decisions regarding facilities and services funded under ESG.

As a state, Utah is not required to consult with homeless or formerly homeless individuals in considering policies and funding decisions regarding facilities and services funded. However, all state sub-recipients, are required to have homeless or previously homeless individuals on their boards.

5. Describe performance standards for evaluating ESG.

State ESG recipient is consulting with all local CoC to develop performance standards that will provide a measure to evaluate each ESG service provider's effectiveness including how well the provider succeeded at 1) targeting those who need the assistance most, 2) reducing the number of people living on the streets or emergency shelters, 3) shortening the time people spend homeless, and 4) reducing each program participant's housing barriers or housing stability risks. SCSO recognizes that performance measures will continue to evolve as we become more proficient in administering the program and better able to identify and address the underlying issues of homelessness.

Discussion:

Appendix - Alternate/Local Data Sources